

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



S. 2115

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951

Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) introduced the following bill;
which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and
Forestry

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices
for basic agricultural commodities.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

5 “(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this
6 section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity,
7 as of any date, shall not be less than its parity price com-
8 puted in the manner used prior to the enactment of the
9 Agricultural Act of 1949.”

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities.

By Mr. YOUNG and Mr. RUSSELL

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued April 17, 1952

For actions of April 16, 1952

82nd-2nd, Nos. 62 and 63

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,16	Import controls.....5	Reclamation.....4,7
Consumers' price index....19	Labor, farm.....10	Road authorizations....17
Emergency powers.....11	Loans, farm.....9	Sheep raising.....14
Flood control.....2,15	Monopoly.....18	Small business.....20
Food storage.....13	Price supports.....3	Soil conservation.....12
Forestry.....14	Purchasing.....8	Wildlife conservation...6

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. Sen. Young inserted his testimony on price supports. Sens. Schoepfel and Thye urged additional flood control.

SENATE

1. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 6947 (pp. 4074, 4079-82). There was no discussion of items involving this Department.
2. FLOOD CONTROL. Sens. Schoepfel and Thye spoke in favor of a stronger flood-control program, a coordinated plan of water retardation and soil conservation, and a disaster insurance program (pp. 4091-4).
3. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Young inserted his testimony before the Agriculture and Forestry Committee favoring S. 2115, to continue the use of the so-called old parity formula, and S. 450, to make mandatory supports at 90% of parity for all nonbasic commodities for which USDA has requested increased production (pp. 4067-9).
4. RECLAMATION. Sen. Watkins inserted his correspondence with the Interior Department indicating that construction of the Pilot Knob Power Plant would not give Calif. any priority over Colorado River waters (pp. 4066-7).
5. IMPORT CONTROLS. Received Calif. Legislature resolutions opposing importation of tuna fish and ladino clover seed (pp. 4058-60).
6. WILDLIFE CONSERVATION. The Government Operations Committee submitted its 1951 report on Federal wildlife conservation activities (S. Rept. 1457) (p. 4062).

BILLS INTRODUCED

7. RECLAMATION. S. 3013, by Sen. Watkins (for himself and Sen. Bennett), to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; to Interior

and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 4062). Remarks of author (pp. 4062-5).

8. PURCHASING. S. 3023, by Sen. Morse (for himself and 13 others), to provide for a Federal supply catalog system to be developed by the Defense Department; to Armed Services Committee (p. 4062). Remarks of author and text of bill (pp. 4099-104).

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

9. FARM CREDIT. S. 2085, to provide for payments to banks for dealing in securities of the Central Bank for Cooperatives. Approved Apr. 9 (Public Law 305, 82nd Cong.).
10. FARM LABOR. S. 2549, to provide special quota immigration visas for alien sheepherders. Approved Apr. 9 (Public Law 307, 82nd Cong.).
11. EMERGENCY POWERS. H. J. Res. 423, to continue until June 1, 1952, certain emergency powers, including one relating to veterans' preference for certain FHA loans, which would have expired upon signature of the Japanese treaty. Approved Apr. 14, 1952. (Public Law 313, 82nd Cong.).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Thyne inserted a speech by Joseph Dambowy urging farmers to carry out good soil conservation practices (pp. A2473-4).
13. FOOD STORAGE. Sen. Martin inserted his radio speech claiming there is "waste and unnecessary bureaucratic spending" throughout the Government and citing the CCC food storage program as one example (pp. A2466-7).
14. FORESTRY; SHEEP RAISING. Sen. Stennis inserted a Miss. Rural Electric News article praising the work done by a young 4-H Club member on forestry and sheep raising projects (pp. A2460-1).
15. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Hagen inserted a Crookston (Minn.) Daily Times editorial criticizing recent House action in eliminating appropriations for continuing the Red River Valley flood-control project (p. A2449).
Sen. Young inserted a Bismarck Tribune editorial stating that completion of the Garrison Dam would prevent floods on the Missouri River at Bismarck (pp. A2458-9).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY GPO

16. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952, H. R. 6947. S. Appropriations Com.
17. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS for 1954 and 1955, S. 2437, S. 2585. S. Public Works Com.
18. MONOPOLY power study. H. Judiciary Committee. H. R. 6295.
19. CONSUMERS' PRICE INDEX, H. Res. 73. H. Education and Labor Committee.
20. SMALL BUSINESS participation in military procurement - No. 4. S. Small Business.

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR APR. 17: Price supports; S. Agriculture. Defense Production Act extension, S. Banking and Currency (ex). Foreign aid program, S. Foreign Relations (ex). Interior and Labor-Federal Security appropriation bills, S. Appropriations (ex).

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

the waters allotted to them and for the purpose allotted, is intended, nor will any conduct or action be taken or permitted which will in any way infringe upon those rights. It seems this is the least that can be done under the circumstances. Also it would seem that you should call attention in your letter to the language in the contract with the Imperial Irrigation District which, in your opinion, carries out this intention. Since you may be completely satisfied in your own mind that the upper basin States' rights have been fully protected, there should be no hesitancy on your part in giving such a writing as suggested and requested herein.

Yours very sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.
WALLACE F. BENNETT.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1952.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: I have your joint letter of March 19 referring to the rights of the States of the Upper Colorado River Basin under the Colorado River Compact in relation to the supplemental contract with the Imperial Irrigation District which, as you know, I signed on March 18. You have no doubt received a copy of the supplemental contract from my representative, Mr. Lineweaver.

At the hearing on March 17 concerning the supplemental contract I stated:

"Representatives of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico in a telegram to Mr. Lineweaver of March 13, which I have read and which is appended hereto, have again referred to the assurances given them at the conference on February 6 and 7 concerning the scope and effect of the supplemental contract and have stated that these States are relying and will in the future rely upon these assurances. In connection with that telegram I want again to reaffirm my concurrence in those assurances. Under no circumstances can the supplemental contract be used as any basis for attempting to defeat the rights of the Upper Basin under the Colorado River Compact, to make full beneficial consumptive use, in accordance with that compact, of the waters apportioned to it thereunder. In fact, in no event and under no circumstances can there be any use of water under the supplemental contract except as subject to and controlled by the Colorado River Compact. Therefore, all users of water throughout the Colorado River Basin are protected in their compact rights."

My remarks at that time are applicable as well to the lengthy statement dated March 12 of representatives of the States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, which was also made a part of the record at the March 17 hearing.

All of these statements of mine are premised primarily upon the last sentence of article 12, paragraphs (a) and (c) of article 16 and upon article 17 of the supplemental contract. The latter article preserves in full force and effect, among others, those provisions of the contract of December 1, 1932 subjecting all water uses by Imperial thereunder to the Colorado River compact.

It seems to me that these provisions to which I have referred state specifically and in terms which cannot be construed to mean otherwise that neither power development at Pilot Knob nor any other uses of water by Imperial growing out of or arising from its contracts with the United States can in the slightest degree have the effect of invading any and all rights of the upper Colorado River Basin to make full beneficial consumptive use, in accordance with the Colorado

River compact, of the waters apportioned to the upper basin under that compact.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the contract articles to which I have referred fully and completely summarize the intention of both parties to the supplemental contract and that the meaning of these provisions is as I have stated. I welcome this opportunity so to advise you.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE SEIZURE OF THE STEEL PLANTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement for not more than 30 seconds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In response to a telephone inquiry of the Boston Herald on April 11, I made a statement to that newspaper regarding the seizure of the country's steel mills by the President of the United States. I should like to repeat it now:

I was terrifically shocked by the President's action in seizing the steel mills. He did not take this action under congressional authority but under broad alleged constitutional authority. The question is now before the courts as it most certainly should be. I hope the ultimate findings of the courts will clearly safeguard us citizens from abuse of administrative powers. If the courts decide the President has these broad constitutional powers, then Congress which is the voice of the people must act promptly to specify just how and when such broad authority can be used and in what grave emergencies, otherwise the authority assumed by our President becomes the power of a dictator.

AGRICULTURE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM—TESTIMONY OF SENATOR YOUNG

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD my testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee on April 16, 1952, in support of the agriculture price-support program.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG BEFORE SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, APRIL 16, 1952

Mr. Chairman, I appear here today in support of two bills, S. 2115, known as the Young-Russell bill, and S. 450. The purpose of S. 2115 is to continue the use of the so-called old parity formula (1910 to 1914 base) for basic farm commodities (wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco) for an indefinite period.

Senate bill 2115 amends section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1949, by providing that, notwithstanding the authorization for the use of a new modernized parity formula, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The 1949 act contains such a provision covering the years through 1953. S. 2115

would continue this provision as a part of the present legislation. Only corn, cotton, wheat, and peanuts are now affected by this provision. Cotton, wheat, and corn are three of the most important crops farmers produce for the existence of mankind. Cotton is extremely important both for clothing the people and for munitions in time of war. Wheat, even in Biblical times, was referred to as the "staff of life." Today in much of the world it still remains the major diet for untold millions. Corn, besides being in the greatest demand for livestock feed, is also valuable for human food and has more than 100 commercial uses. No nation could maintain a high standard of living without an abundance of all three of these important commodities.

The parity price of rice and tobacco computed by the modernized formula is higher than when computed by the old formula. The parity prices of the other basic agricultural commodities computed by the two formulas compared as follows as of November 15, 1951:

	Effective parity, old formula	Modernized parity, new formula	Difference
Corn, per bushel.....	\$1.77	\$1.62	\$0.15
Cotton, per pound.....	.34	.32	.02
Wheat, per bushel.....	2.43	2.11	.32
Peanuts, per pound.....	.13	.11	.02

The modernized parity formula uses, as a major factor in determining parity, the average prices received by farmers for the previous 10-year period. This method of determining parity may have considerable merit in normal times. Under conditions which have existed for the past several years, and likewise exist now, this method of computing parity represents a serious injustice to a large and important segment of agriculture.

For example, during most of the past 5-year period, many farm commodity prices were held down both by OPS-imposed ceilings and by surpluses intentionally carried under a Government program calculated to meet the war emergency. Thus, the modernized parity formula does not reflect the actual market price these commodities would have demanded had it not been for the unusual circumstances of this period. Cotton would have been much higher over much of this period had it not been for ceiling prices and export quotas imposed by the Government. You will recall that world cotton prices climbed as high as 65 to 70 cents per pound in 1950, largely because American production was very short. Yet United States cotton prices were held to about 45 cents per pound under OPS order. If and when cotton production goals are reached, and the planned surplus to meet the war emergency situation is met, cotton prices most certainly will decline—probably to the low levels to which they had descended previous to the Korean war.

During World War II and following, it became necessary for the United States to furnish great quantities of wheat to the starving people of the world. To meet the minimum requirements of the many nations which at that time were begging for wheat, the United States allocated its insufficient supply as best it could under the circumstances. Our exports were so heavy that the carry-over of wheat as of July 1, 1947, reached a low of 83,000,000 bushels. It was during this period that Congress, through an amendment to an appropriation bill, prohibited further exports when our domestic carry-over reached a minimum of 150,000,000 bushels.

To meet the contingencies in the present war emergency period, our Government, acting through the United States Department

of Agriculture, has asked for increased production even though our present carryovers would represent a surplus in normal times. Our carryover of wheat on July 1, 1952, is expected to be near 300,000,000 bushels. These surpluses are a most depressing factor on market prices. There is little possibility that wheat prices will ever reach parity under a Government program of high production and planned huge carryovers. The surpluses thus created are far more effective in holding prices down than are ceiling prices under OPS.

The foregoing ought to be ample proof that during this war emergency period of planned large carryovers and resultant depressed prices, the modernized parity formula cannot and does not reflect what normal prices would otherwise be. As a result of these conditions, the spread between parity as computed under the old parity formula and the new parity formula is increasing. For example, in 1950 the spread was 29 cents a bushel on wheat and presently the spread is 33 cents a bushel. In 1950 the spread on corn as between the old parity formula and the modernized formula was 12 cents a bushel. By 1952 this spread had reached 16 cents a bushel.

It was the contention of the authors of the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949, in substituting the modernized parity formula for the old parity formula, that the spread would tend to narrow year by year. If the years following the enactment of this long range price support legislation had been normal years, free from the impact of war and war emergencies, I am inclined to believe there would then have been considerable justification for this position. But, as I have pointed out, the subsequent years were in no sense normal.

If the modernized parity formula were permitted to go into effect with the 1954 crop, it would have serious and far-reaching effects on producers of basic farm commodities. It would result in a severe penalty not deserved by these producers. The producers are patriotic and are endeavoring as best they can, against many odds, to meet the production goals of the Government of the United States. By their very conscientious efforts to produce to the limit, they are, in effect, lowering parity levels to their own future disadvantage for years and years to come. This lowering of parity will not only adversely affect price-support levels, but will also have a direct bearing on ceiling prices imposed by OPS as ceilings are based on parity levels.

To the extent that the current high production goals and increased carry-overs are achieved, supplies will keep the prices of storable commodities from rising to parity or above. They may continue at times to sag below the loan level. Whenever a particular season's market price is depressed as compared with prices which would prevail for normal supplies, this has a depressing influence on the parity price the following year. For every 10 percent rise or fall in the market price of a commodity under the new formula, its parity price will be raised or lowered 1 percent the following year. Thus the shift to the new parity formula, with price supports continued at 75 to 90 percent of parity, would result in a reduction of the future parity price of the commodity if high-level production programs are successful in achieving increased carry-overs.

We need increased production of these three major farm commodities and others to meet the war emergency. If the modernized parity formula goes into effect, as it will unless the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended, as of today there would be a drop in wheat support prices of approximately 30 cents a bushel, cotton 2 cents a pound, and corn of approximately 14 cents a bushel.

The carry-over of corn as of July 1 this year will be dangerously low in spite of favorable crop years. The situation is even worse with respect to cotton. If we should have 1 year of unfavorable weather for crop production, our supplies of wheat, cotton and corn would be far below war emergency goals. After more than 10 years of favorable crop conditions for wheat and corn, it would seem that we might expect at least one unfavorable year. The loss of even one-third of 1 year's production would have a most serious effect on our economy and our war effort. This could happen if there were a return of the drought such as we experienced in 1934 and 1936. To meet these and other emergencies we must maintain high production. I submit that lowering support levels would be a severe and, perhaps, a dangerous blow to our program of increased production.

The Government of the United States in other fields is stockpiling strategic war materials such as lead, tin, rubber, and manganese. The Government likewise hopes to stockpile a sizeable amount of important farm commodities. The stockpiling of farm commodities should be held in a separate stockpile aside from the farm program as are strategic materials needed by industry. Even though large surpluses have been carried for war-emergency purposes as a part of the program of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the price-support program, the losses, if indeed there be any, over a long period of years appear to be surprisingly low.

Over the 18 years of the operation of the price-support programs so far as basic commodities are concerned, there has been a profit to the Government of the United States totaling approximately \$40,000,000 as of July 1 last.

As I have previously pointed out, large carry-overs of important farm products effectively hold down the prices and result in a great savings to the consumers themselves. In addition, these same carry-overs play a most important part in our over-all war emergency program. If the farmers were only looking to their own self-interests, disregarding the Government's needs in this present period—which I am sure none of them would do—they would be curtailing production instead of increasing it. Every farmer knows that surpluses inevitably mean lower prices. I think it is safe to say that if we maintained a carry-over of wheat, for example, in the amount of 500,000,000 bushels without any price-support program, the actual price in the market place would not be more than \$1 a bushel. On the other hand, if we had a carry-over of only 83,000,000 bushels, as was the case in 1947, prices would again reach the \$3.50 a bushel level for that period or possibly even more.

It is my firm belief that favorable farm prices following World War II, largely as a result of price supports and export programs, prevented the usual expected post-war depression. The simple facts are that no political party can operate the affairs of the United States on the basis of full employment and financial solvency unless agriculture receives parity or above for its products. The reason is obvious because without such a price level we cannot generate or produce the national income required. The turn-over, for example, of farm income is about seven times as reflected in national income and each dollar of gross farm income will result in \$7 of national income. I believe an enlightened industry realizes they will lose 10 percent of their business volume for each 10 percent of reduction of gross farm income.

For years national income has always been approximately seven times that of the farm income. As an over-all picture, it should be pointed out that cash income of farmers,

the value of all farm products sold in the market place, increased 193 percent from 1929 to 1951. Nonagricultural income in this same period increased 194 percent. This situation could not exist after all the economic changes which have taken place since 1929 unless there was an immutable law of exchange or relationship between gross farm income and national income. The proper use of reasonable amounts of money each year in supporting farm prices can prevent a loss of billions to the national economy. Most economists recognize the fact that all of our depressions have been farm led. We just cannot afford to have another depression with its disastrous effect on all segments of our economy.

The total net public and private debt in 1938 was \$184,500,000,000 and in 1951 it had risen to a total of \$514,400,000,000. If we wish to retain our American system this debt must be paid. Regardless of how the debt was accumulated, the fact remains that to repay and service it requires Government action not necessary in past years of low debt, and when there was in operation a real competitive free enterprise system. Any sizeable reduction in our present price and wage level would reduce our ability to create the income required to meet the debt and retire it through efficient and sound fiscal policies established by the Government.

It is safe to say that the foregoing cannot be accomplished unless farm prices are supported at a level of not less than 90 percent of parity. Support prices on about 10 non-perishable farm commodities, plus a few perishables, would be sufficient foundation for national stability. The national economic policy should be carried on in terms of its over-all effect on national income rather than the minor cost of price supports. We lost over \$500,000,000,000 in national income during the period from 1930 to 1941 because we did not maintain our 1929 price level. A drop of 50 percent in our current farm prices would force the Nation to lose \$135,000,000,000 a year in national income. The result would be national chaos.

While gross farm income over the past few years has remained at approximately the same level, there has been a continuing drop in the percent of net farm income. This is a direct result of ever increasing costs of all the things a farmer has to buy. Another round of wage increases unquestionably will be reflected in even higher costs of all the goods and services the farmer must buy and he is one of the greatest purchasers in our economy. Presently farm operating costs are the highest in history. Only a short period of low farm production resulting from drought or other reasons could and undoubtedly would break most of the farm producers of this Nation. If in subsequent years there is a surplus of industrial production and the labor supply becomes more adequate which would make possible the return of a real competitive situation in these fields and a resultant trend toward lower consumer prices, then and only then could farmers survive without adequate price supports.

Mr. Chairman, S. 450, which I also introduced, is very similar to the so-called Steagall amendment which was in effect during World War II and for 2 years thereafter. It would make mandatory supports of 90 percent of parity for all nonbasic commodities for which the United States Department of Agriculture has requested increased production. It would seem to me that this is only simple justice to the producers, and it is the only way I know that adequate production can be had. Presently our supplies of feed grains are low and, again, the Government is asking for increased production. The present price of feed, and particularly oats, does not provide sufficient incentive for farmers to plant the increased acreage necessary.

Heavy importations for the last few years of wool, rye, barley, oats, and feed wheat have

had a most unfavorable effect on domestic prices for these commodities. These large importations mean that there is no chance for the farmers in this country to get parity prices unless there is a shortage of these commodities existing in the exporting countries. These imports into the United States, encouraged largely by the scarcity and high monetary value of the United States dollar, are expected to continue under existing tariffs. I see no possibility of the farmers of the United States competing price-wise with the many producing areas of the world where wages, taxes, operation costs in general, and indeed the living standard itself is much lower than in the United States.

Support prices for oats and barley presently are 80 percent of parity. This 80 percent of parity, using as we do the modernized parity formula, hardly equals the 70 percent of parity under the old or 1910-14 base period formula. If we want increased production of feed grains and other nonbasic commodities, there is only one way in which it can be had and that is through an adequate price incentive.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. TAGE ERLANDER, PRIME MINISTER OF SWEDEN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the presence in the Chamber today of a very distinguished visitor, Hon. Tage Erlander, Prime Minister of Sweden. I know that I express the sentiments of all Senators in welcoming him to the Chamber of the United States Senate. Our relations with his country have always been most friendly and co-operative. I am sure that Senators are happy to join me in greeting the Prime Minister of Sweden. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair takes the liberty of joining Members of the Senate in welcoming this distinguished statesman not only to our country but to this Chamber, where he has a right to sit under the rules of the Senate. We are very glad to have you, and we hope that your visit to us will prove both pleasant and profitable.

STUDY OF FEDERAL SEIZURE OF STEEL MILLS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution relating to the seizure of steel plants and facilities by the Federal Government. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 306), submitted by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas by Executive Order 10340, dated April 8, 1952, the President directed the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and operate the plants and facilities of certain steel companies; and

Whereas the Secretary of Commerce has proceeded to carry out such Executive order; and

Whereas the President cited no specific constitutional or statutory provision in support of his action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study concerning the action of the President in directing the Secretary of Commerce to take possession of and operate the plants and facilities of certain steel companies, with a view to determining whether there is any constitutional or statutory authority for such action, and to report the results of its study to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the seizure of the steel industry by the President of the United States has raised the gravest constitutional question since the War Between the States. I am offering on behalf of myself and a number of colleagues, a resolution directing the Judiciary Committee of the Senate to hold prompt hearings on this injustice and resolve the basic legal and property issues raised by the President's unwarranted and arbitrary act.

I do not intend to discuss the dispute between the steel unions and the companies. Those questions are subsidiary and superficial when measured against the enormity of the President's act. Nor am I speaking in a partisan spirit. This constitutional crisis is beyond politics. It transcends party.

The Democratic Party went on record on this issue long ago. Perhaps the shock of the administration's action last week is heightened by the words of Woodrow Wilson, a great Democratic President, who said, "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

This issue goes to the heart of our existence as a free people.

The real question is the basic one of executive usurpation of government by fiat. It is involved with the right to own and enjoy property under the law, free from overweening executive power; a right and privilege which we had thought until the other day was secure; a right which Anglo-Saxon peoples have held sacred since the Magna Carta—a period of 800 years. Are we to be governed by law with the guaranty of due process for all our citizens, or are we to be subjected to the arbitrary whim or caprice of the executive? In a word, are we to have a government of laws or a government of men?

The President's Executive order of April 8, directing the Secretary of Commerce to seize and operate the plants

and facilities of the steel industry was without constitutional sanction, without statutory authority, and was in direct violation of the will of Congress as set forth when, on April 7, Congress specifically withheld from the President the statutory power to seize which he has now asserted by some nebulous claim of "inherent power." Furthermore, in his order and accompanying statement he set forth no legal opinion in support of his claim.

Why did the President commit himself to this grave act without the benefit of expert legal opinion? Why is it that he seized the steel industry without an opinion from his Attorney General or of any great constitutional lawyer? Is it because he knew he could get no sound legal opinion supporting this act? I have before me the opinion of a man who stands at the head of the American bar, John W. Davis, who himself was a distinguished candidate for the Presidency on the Democratic ticket. No one will doubt Mr. Davis' intelligence and scholarship. I quote him:

It is my firm conviction that the President has no undefined inherent powers, either in war or in peace, under which he could seize * * * mills to settle a labor dispute. The machinery set up by title V of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and by the Labor Management Act of 1947, are the remedies provided by Congress to deal with such situations. These are, in my opinion, the only remedies expressly provided by Congress to deal with such situations. These are, in my opinion, the only remedies properly available under either the Constitution or statute. Beyond these, the President has no power or authority to deal by seizure with labor disputes in the steel industry.

I have also an opinion from Prof. Edwin S. Corwin, of Princeton University, who is perhaps the best academic authority on the limitations of the presidential office. Dr. Corwin is the author of *The President: Office and Powers and Constitutional Power in a Secular State*. Speaking of the President's seizure of the steel mills Dr. Corwin said:

One would find it difficult to imagine a subject of constitutional interpretation which calls more vehemently for investigation at this moment.

It is Dr. Corwin's view that—

Ultimately justification must be sought in the Constitution itself; that is to say, in the Constitution as it has come to be authoritatively interpreted. Current tendencies need a thorough going over.

I continue to quote:

I should cite in this connection the fact that in recent years Congress has come to treat "national emergency" and "state of war" as substantially synonymous terms (see *Brown v. Bernstein* (49 Fed. Supp. 728, 730-32, 1943)) and the fact that the court has adopted the habit of piecing out delegated powers to the President by means of references to his powers "under the Constitution as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy" (*U. S. Mine Workers of America* (330 U. S. 258, 262, 1947)).

Also there is the inclination on the part of the spokesmen for labor to rely on what is termed the President's "inherent power" to meet emergencies in referring to legislative provisions for heading off disabling

strikes. (See hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 81st Cong., 1st sess., Senate, for repealing the Taft-Hartley Act; also Julius and Lillian Cohen, 1943, *Divine Rights of Presidents*, 29, *Nebraska Law Review*, March 1950.)

It is clear that the eminent constitutional authority, Dr. Corwin, takes the gravest view possible of this crisis. He concludes his opinion with these words:

What is happening in light of these developments to our concept of government, of laws, and not of men is all too plain to need emphasis.

Never in the history of the United States has a President acted with such disregard of the Constitution, the law, and the will of Congress and the people. The long history of the relationship between the executive and the legislative in our western countries has been beset with many conflicts. Steadily, however, the people and their elected representatives have advanced and supported the claim of the public will against executive prerogative. At the very heart of our own governmental structure lies the principle of the division of powers, whereby the legislature makes the laws, the executive administers them. That principle opposes at all points the theory of absolute rule. The President's assertion of independence of law and Congress, embodied in his claim to "inherent rights," is just a new name for the outworn doctrine of the divine right of kings. In truth, a king has been beheaded for similar attempts to override the will of the people.

No President before this time ever has asserted the right to make law. It has been pointed out, and I call attention to the fact that all the seizures of industrial properties which have occurred under the last two administrations have been accomplished under the cover of legality. President Roosevelt, beginning with the North American Aviation Co. in 1941, seized many factories and businesses, but always under powers given him by the Congress. He acted under the Smith-Connally Act and under the successive war powers acts. He never claimed inherent right in defiance of the Congress. President Truman likewise has made many seizures, virtually all of them as a means of settlement of wage disputes and averting strikes, but until now all his seizures were made under provisions of law.

The argument that he faced an emergency under which seizure was the only remedy is not correct. The President had several alternatives had he wished to obey rather than flout the law. Mr. President, may I remind you that, above all men, the President of the United States should set an example of obedience to law and constitutional authority. It was his plain duty to proceed under the terms of the Taft-Hartley Act. His excuse for ignoring the Taft-Hartley Act was transparently flimsy. As you know, the Taft-Hartley Act was provided for just such an emergency. It was fitted and tailored to that task. Under the Taft-Hartley Act there was provided a further cooling-off period of 80 days, during which the normal process of collective bargaining might have

resolved the dispute, if both parties had been assured that the President was acting in good faith and did not intend to impose his will on the controversy. It was the latent threat of Executive action without the basis of law that, more than any other factor, prevented a solution to what should have been a normal, ordinary process of finding a solution between management and labor. The President's implied determination to impose his will helped create the impasse in the steel dispute. There remained to the President the process of injunction which had previously been used against a labor leader not so close to the throne.

The President's cry of emergency is as specious as his action without the basis of law. He claims that he acted to insure the flow of steel because we are in a war emergency and yet he has consistently denied that we are at war. It is clear that the President's appeal to emergency is a trumped-up appeal. It is clear that his motives in this respect are subject to question.

I have pointed out that the steel seizure and the irresponsible making of law by the Chief Executive were not required by the necessities of the situation. We have provided legal methods for the handling of great labor disputes which might involve the welfare and security of the Nation. The President has arbitrarily chosen to use none of these instruments, but to substitute his own will. If this is permitted to pass unnoticed and unchallenged, we of this Congress might as well shut up shop and go home.

Nowhere in the Western World, even under the Socialist-Labor Government of Britain or the other Socialist governments of Western Europe, has such an arbitrary defiance of the legislative body taken place. In every country in Europe, expropriation has been the result of the direct act of the parliament or the legislative body concerned. To find a parallel to this seizure one must look not to the countries of Western Europe, but to the totalitarian regimes of Italy under Mussolini, Germany under Hitler, and Russia under Stalin.

I need not remind you that government by ukase, government by fiat, is the hallmark of despotism. If President Truman's act goes unrejected and unrebuked by this Congress, then we have started along the road to the very tyranny which we are allegedly opposing throughout the earth. The President's unprecedented act, repugnant though it is to the whole tradition of representative government, is congenial to the regimes which we vanquished in World War II and the threat of Moscow which we now confront.

The most disturbing fact in this situation is that once the constitutional bounds are breached, there is no law. Where there is no law, no man can be secure in his life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. We leave the well-marked road of constitutional and lawful procedure, and enter into the chaos of personal government. If the President of the United States can seize the steel industry, what is to prevent his seizing the

beef cattle on the ranges and dairy cattle on the farms; appropriating the herds and the land on which they graze? What is to prevent his seizing your home? One of the first acts of dictatorship, after consolidating its power, is to seize the trade unions. How is this done? We have seen examples in Italy, in Germany, and in Russia. The government swoops down on the trade-union offices, appropriates the books and lists of members, and installs its own creatures in command of the union. The labor organizations become mere tools of the executive power; the workers pass under the heel of the state.

The labor leaders of America are existing in a dream state if they believe that the abuse of the President's powers in their behalf does not set a precedent that would eventually undo them. They should be in the very forefront of Americans opposing the President's seizure of the steel industry. With the example of the totalitarian states before them, they should resist to their utmost every show of illegal force by the Executive. Only in the free climate of a properly balanced government, existing by law, can the trade-unions survive and flourish. We have seen that truth demonstrated over and over.

This is a dark hour for the Republic. We are threatened from abroad by a vast and sinister empire which, not content with waging war against us in the far reaches of Asia, spreads its tentacles of subversion in our midst. We frequently hear that the call in this hour of peril is for national unity. Have we not the right to expect that our constituted authorities shall refrain from reckless and unconstitutional procedures at a time when our very survival may be hanging in the balance?

All Senators should make common cause on this issue, and should authorize an immediate and prompt investigation into the nature of the President's seizure order, and should take corrective legislative action to end this present usurpation and to avert others that may occur in the future. Democrats and Republicans alike should act. The preservation of our constitutional way of life should not be a partisan matter. The duty of every Member of this honorable body is plain and distinct. I shall not take further time now, Mr. President, but I hope most of us will agree that an investigation of this subject should be conducted by the Judiciary Committee.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered yesterday at Pittsburgh by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] be printed at this point in the *RECORD*, at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SEIZURE OF THE STEEL INDUSTRY

On April 8, after it appeared to be impossible to settle the labor dispute in the steel industry by voluntary agreement, President Truman directed the Secretary of

PARITY PRICES OF BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

JUNE 4, 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2115]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2115) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

Amend the bill on line 7, after the word "date", by inserting the following: "during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950".

S. 2115 was referred to a subcommittee which held hearings on the bill and reported it back with the amendment recommended by your committee above. The report of the subcommittee is attached hereto as appendix A.

The bill as introduced provided that the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities be continued indefinitely. The law now provides that the parity price of any basic agricultural commodity shall be the higher of its parity prices computed under the old and new parity formulas through the year 1953. The subcommittee amendment which has been approved by your committee would extend this provision two more years, that is, through 1955.

Subsequent to the hearings on the bill, the Department of Agriculture submitted its views on the proposed amendment in a letter dated June 4, 1952, expressing general approval of the proposed extension of the dual parity system for the six basic commodities for two additional years. A copy of the letter is attached hereto as appendix B.

Government price controls and other abnormal conditions growing out of the current defense mobilization efforts have upset normal market price trends. Without abandoning the objective of shifting

all farm products to the modernized parity as rapidly as is possible without causing economic hardships, the bill would assure producers of the basic crops against any sharp change in parity prices until 1956. It is hoped that normal market price forces will be operating again by that time, so that the shift from the old to the modernized parity formula can be made without serious hardship to anyone.

Your committee views this legislation as particularly important at this time. Farmers are being asked to achieve record production goals in 1952 and similar record production will be needed in 1953 and perhaps for several years. Without the enactment of S. 2115, large groups of producers face sharp reductions in the parity price for their product in 1954. Farmers cannot be expected to do their best productionwise unless such an adverse situation is prevented.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SEC. 301 (a) (1)	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the **four-year** *six-year* period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON S. 2115, TO CONTINUE THE EXISTING METHOD OF COMPUTING PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Your subcommittee, appointed to consider S. 2115, to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, submits the following report with the recommendation that the bill be enacted with the following amendment:

In line 7, after the word "date", insert the following: "during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950".

ANALYSIS

Section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, provides that during the 4-year period beginning January 1, 1950, the parity price for each of the basic commodities—corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat—shall be not less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949. S. 2115, as introduced and referred to your subcommittee, would have extended this provision permanently. With the amendment recommended by your subcommittee, S. 2115 would extend this provision for 2 years, through December 31, 1955.

STATEMENT

At the time of enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which added section 301 (a) (1) (G) to the 1938 act, it was believed that a 4-year period would be sufficient to permit a gradual transition during which, as the trend then indicated, the "modernized" parity prices for the basic commodities would gradually

approach their "old" parity prices. However, since that time the Korean war has intervened and price and other economic controls have been provided by the Defense Production Act of 1950. The modernized parity prices for wheat, corn, and peanuts are still considerably below their "old" parity prices, and in view of the extent to which the economy is now controlled, it appears that the 4-year period originally provided for in section 301 (a) (1) (G) does not allow sufficient time for an orderly and gradual transition to the new parity formula. Your subcommittee therefore recommends that the 4-year period be extended to a 6-year period. For the reasons set out in the attached report from the Department of Agriculture, your subcommittee does not believe that section 301 (a) (1) (G) should be extended permanently.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., February 13, 1952.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your request of September 13 for a report on S. 2115, a bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities.

The proposed bill would amend section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the parity price to be used for the six basic commodities—cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. Section 301 now requires that during the 4-year period beginning January 1, 1950, the parity price used for any basic commodity shall not be less than the parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949, even though a new or modernized method of computing parity price was authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1949, effective January 1, 1950. The proposed bill would change this requirement from one limited to 4 years to a permanent requirement.

The effect of S. 2115 would be to make permanent the requirement that the parity price for a basic commodity shall be the new parity or the old parity, whichever is higher. However, it would not affect parity prices for basic commodities until January 1, 1954, because present legislation requires the use of the higher of new or old parity through that date.

In the absence of the proposed bill, beginning in January 1954 the parity price for all basic commodities would be computed on the basis of the new method which has been used since January 1950 for most commodities. The change-over at that time from the use of the old or new parity price, whichever is higher, to a new parity price basis probably would affect only four of the six basic commodities—wheat, peanuts, cotton, and corn. Currently, parity prices for both rice and tobacco are computed on the basis of new parity since the new parity is higher than the old parity. Parity prices for the six basic commodities at the start of the marketing season in 1950 and 1951—the 2 years in which the present section 301 has been in operation—are shown in the enclosed table. This table indicates for each basic commodity the old and new parity price and the effective parity price, that is, the higher of the old or new parity.

The current temporary provision, which the proposed bill would make permanent, has resulted in criticism of the parity-price concept. This criticism has been based largely on the contention that the use of the higher of two parity standards defeats the purpose of parity price, and parity becomes a means of influencing the level of price support rather than a standard used to measure the degree to which farm prices are in line with what Congress has defined as a fair goal or objective. This criticism is of concern to the Department because it has had repercussions on the price-support programs.

Under these circumstances, the Department is of the opinion that legislation which prohibits a change-over to the new method of computing parity, other than legislation aimed at providing a transition from the old to the new method in a manner which will minimize the effects of the change-over on producers, has more disadvantages than it has advantages looking at the legislation from the standpoint of the entire agricultural program. The proposed bill would not permit such a change-over, since it would require the use of the old parity indefinitely in those cases where old parity is above new parity. While the nonbasic commodities will all be based upon the modernized parity basis within a relatively short time, the present bill would require the Department to compute the old

and new parity prices for the six basic commodities for an indefinite period and to always use the higher of the old or new parity.

If it is the desire of Congress that the price-support level for any or all of the basic commodities affected by this legislation be maintained at levels higher than those for other commodities, we believe that a more desirable approach to the problem would be to alter the basic legislation governing the percentage of parity at which commodities are to be supported, rather than to establish a different method of computing parity for these commodities. This direct approach would enable the issue of the need for a higher level of support to be clearly brought out and discussed. It also would avoid undue criticism of the parity standard which, for so many years, has been the cornerstone of our agricultural programs.

The Department does not recommend that S. 2115 be passed.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*

Old parity, modernized parity, and effective parity prices for 6 basic commodities at start of marketing season, 1950 and 1951 crops

Commodity	Unit	1950			1951		
		Old parity	Modernized parity	Effective parity	Old parity	Modernized parity	Effective parity
Cotton.....	Pound.....	\$0.3100	\$0.2849	\$0.3100	\$0.3385	\$0.3212	\$0.3385
Wheat.....	BusheL.....	2.21	1.88	2.21	2.42	2.10	2.42
Corn.....	do.....	1.63	1.49	1.63	1.75	1.60	1.75
Peanuts.....	Pound.....	.120	.0957	.120	.131	.107	.131
Rice.....	Hundredweight.....	4.51	5.07	5.07	4.94	5.56	5.56
Tobacco:							
Flue-cured, 11-14.....	Pound.....	.481	.500	.500	.529	.563	.563
Burley, 31.....	do.....	.475	.508	.508	.511	.553	.553

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, *Chairman.*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

MILTON R. YOUNG.

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., June 4, 1952.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: On April 18, in connection with my testimony before your committee on S. 2115, a bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, I indicated that there was merit in delaying the shift from the "old" to the "new" parity price until the emergency is over. As requested by your committee, I am furnishing additional information as to why this shift should be delayed.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides that the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity during a 4-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than the parity price computed according to the formula in effect prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The practical effect of this provision is that the effective parity price of the basic commodities through 1953 is the "old" or "new" parity, whichever is higher.

In October 1949, when the Agricultural Act of 1949 was approved, "new" parity prices were lower than the "old" parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. However, there appeared to be at least a fair possibility that the gap between the "old" and "new" parity prices for these commodities would narrow during the 4-year period specified. The possibility that the gap would narrow was based on an assumption that the general level of prices received by farmers would continue to decline and that prices of wheat, corn, and cotton, buttressed

by price supports and production adjustment measures, would be at least as high if not higher in relation to parity than the general level of agricultural prices.

These price prospects did not materialize to a large extent due to the emergency which arose with the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Actually, the general level of agricultural prices started increasing in early 1950 and it increased sharply after the Korean outbreak.

Production plans also had to be altered due to the emergency. High-level production again became necessary to take care of increased current needs and to replenish reserve stocks.

Farmers responded to the Government's request for high-level production of certain major commodities. Production of some commodities went up more than others. Price changes varied between commodities. For example, prices of livestock items went up sharply as compared with most of the basic commodities.

Under these emergency conditions, prices of corn, wheat, and peanuts did not advance as rapidly as did the general level of prices received by farmers. As a result, the general level of agricultural prices was more favorable in relation to parity in both 1950 and in 1951 than were prices of wheat, corn, and peanuts relative to parity. This situation is continuing in 1952.

In other words, as a result of developments arising from the emergency, the prospect that the gap between "old" and "new" parity price would narrow has not materialized.

"Old" parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts have been higher than the "new" parity prices all during the period since 1950. This is still true. It now appears fairly definite that by the end of 1953 "old" parity prices will still be well above the "new" parity prices for wheat, corn, and peanuts.

It seems unwise to permit a sharp drop in the price support levels for the basic commodities at a time when farmers are being asked to increase and maintain production during an emergency period. One way to avoid this would be to continue to use the "old" or "new" parity price through 1955.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*



Calendar No. 1604

82^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 2115

[Report No. 1674]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951

Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) introduced the following bill;
which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and
Forestry

JUNE 4, 1952

Reported by Mr. YOUNG, with an amendment

[Insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices
for basic agricultural commodities.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:
5 “(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this
6 section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity
7 as of any date *during the six-year period beginning Janu-*
8 *ary 1, 1950,* shall not be less than its parity price computed
9 in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural
10 Act of 1949.”

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities.

By Mr. Young and Mr. Russell

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 4), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 4, 1952

Reported with an amendment

H. R. 8122

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 19, 1914.

Reported by Mr. [Name], of [State],
Committee on [Committee Name].

With amendments.

A BILL

to [Title of Bill]

1. [Text of Bill]

2. [Text of Bill]

3. [Text of Bill]

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1000 S. MICHIGAN AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILL. 60607

TEL. 773-936-5000 FAX 773-936-5001

WWW.CHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, ILL. 60607

THE BILL

1000 S. MICHIGAN AVENUE

CHICAGO, ILL. 60607

82^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8122

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 9, 1952

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

5 “(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this
6 section, the parity price for any basic agricultural com-
7 modity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning
8 January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price
9 computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the
10 Agricultural Act of 1949.”

11 SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949

1 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end
2 of section 101 (d) thereof:

3 “(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90
4 per centum of the parity price for the 1953, 1954, and 1955
5 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to
6 which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.”

82ND CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8122

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing
parity prices for basic agricultural commod-
ities, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COOLEY

JUNE 9, 1952

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

JUNE 17, 1952.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 8122]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

The purpose of this bill is to continue the present support program for the basic agricultural commodities through 1955.

Section 1 of the bill is identical with the bill (S. 2115) recently reported with a favorable recommendation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This section of the bill would continue for two additional years (through 1955) the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which provides for a transitional period following the adoption of the modernized parity formula in which parity for the basic commodities is to be not less than the level under the formula in use prior to 1949.

When the modernized parity formula was adopted in the act of 1949, it was assumed that agriculture was entering a period of retrenchment when there would be a diminishing demand for American agricultural exports, less necessity for production of cereals, and a general shift to grass farming and livestock products to meet the demands of American consumers. Accordingly, the modernized parity formula established in the act of 1949 was intended to encourage and assist the adjustment of American agriculture in this direction.

Unfortunately, the period of normal, peaceful world relationships and consumer demands contemplated at that time did not materialize.

On the contrary, the Nation has found itself involved in the Korean war and a far-flung defense effort which has virtually put American agriculture again on a wartime footing, with unprecedented demands for cereals, cotton, and similar agricultural commodities.

Under these circumstances, extension for 2 years of the alternative parity provision of the 1949 act is in direct conformity with the principles of the act and is much more in keeping with the policies established therein than would be adherence to the existing letter of the law and termination of that provision at the end of 1953.

The Secretary of Agriculture has recommended the adoption of the provisions of section 1 of the bill and his letter to Senator Ellender, recommending approval of S. 2115 reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., June 4, 1952.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: On April 18, in connection with my testimony before your committee on S. 2115, a bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, I indicated that there was merit in delaying the shift from the "old" to the "new" parity price until the emergency is over. As requested by your committee, I am furnishing additional information as to why this shift should be delayed.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 provides that the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity during a 4-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than the parity price computed according to the formula in effect prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The practical effect of this provision is that the effective parity price of the basic commodities through 1953 is the "old" or "new" parity, whichever is higher.

In October 1949, when the Agricultural Act of 1949 was approved, "new" parity prices were lower than the "old" parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts. However, there appeared to be at least a fair possibility that the gap between the "old" and "new" parity prices for these commodities would narrow during the 4-year period specified. The possibility that the gap would narrow was based on an assumption that the general level of prices received by farmers would continue to decline and that prices of wheat, corn, and cotton, buttressed by price supports and production adjustment measures, would be at least as high if not higher in relation to parity than the general level of agricultural prices.

These price prospects did not materialize to a large extent due to the emergency which arose with the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Actually, the general level of agricultural prices started increasing in early 1950 and it increased sharply after the Korean outbreak.

Production plans also had to be altered due to the emergency. High-level production again became necessary to take care of increased current needs and to replenish reserve stocks.

Farmers responded to the Government's request for high-level production of certain major commodities. Production of some commodities went up more than others. Price changes varied between commodities. For example, prices of livestock items went up sharply as compared with most of the basic commodities.

Under these emergency conditions, prices of corn, wheat, and peanuts did not advance as rapidly as did the general level of prices received by farmers. As a result, the general level of agricultural prices was more favorable in relation to parity in both 1950 and in 1951 than were prices of wheat, corn, and peanuts relative to parity. This situation is continuing in 1952.

In other words, as a result of developments arising from the emergency, the prospect that the gap between "old" and "new" parity price would narrow has not materialized.

"Old" parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts have been higher than the "new" parity prices all during the period since 1950. This is still true. It now appears fairly definite that by the end of 1953 "old" parity prices will still be well above the "new" parity prices for wheat, corn, and peanuts.

It seems unwise to permit a sharp drop in the price support levels for the basic commodities at a time when farmers are being asked to increase and maintain

production during an emergency period. One way to avoid this would be to continue to use the "old" or "new" parity price through 1955.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*

THE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Section 2 of the bill will extend for the same period of time (through 1955) the present price-support program for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. It is the belief of the committee that the enactment of this provision is absolutely essential to assure the Nation adequate production of these important agricultural commodities during this emergency period.

All of these commodities are being supported at 90 percent of parity at the present time. It is probable that the Secretary of Agriculture would continue to support them at that level for the period prescribed by this bill. It is unlikely, therefore, that this bill will add anything whatever to the responsibility of the Government with respect to the support of these commodities.

On the other hand, it is certain that the bill will add tremendously to the response which may be expected from farmers to the Government's request for high-level agricultural production. Farmers have shown time and again since 1940 their willingness and their ability to meet unprecedented goals established by the Department of Agriculture. They know full well, however, that under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 they are acceding to the Government's request and meeting these high production goals at their own risk.

Production goals are established on the basis of the average out-turn which is expected per acre for the various crops. Good weather can boost that out-turn by as much as 20 or 25 percent, resulting in a crop even larger than that requested by the Department of Agriculture. A decrease in anticipated demand, either for exports, for stockpiling, or for domestic consumption can also occur. In either event, farmers who had patriotically undertaken to meet the Nation's production goals would find that they had created a situation in which their over-abundant production had destroyed their price at the market place and that price support would be reduced correspondingly at the very time when it was most needed.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the required level of price support for these basic commodities is determined by the carry-over which exists at the beginning of the marketing year. If this carry-over is larger than normal, the support level may be reduced in proportion to the size of the carry-over.

Obviously, the Government is going to have a much more certain assurance of the tremendous agricultural production it requests during these important years if farmers have the assurance that by acceding to the Department of Agriculture's high production goals they are not going to produce themselves out of a fair market price and at the same time produce themselves out of a fair support price.

Hearings were held on the bill on June 11 and 12. Extensive testimony was presented by the Secretary of Agriculture and by all of the major farm organizations.

DEPARTMENT REPORT

Approval of H. R. 8122 is recommended by the Department of Agriculture and the letter from Secretary Brannan to Hon. Harold D.

Cooley, chairman of the committee, recommending such approval is appended hereto and made a part of this report.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., June 10, 1952.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of June 6, 1952, for a report on H. R. 8122, a bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities and for other purposes.

This bill would make two changes in existing legislation relating to price support:

1. It would extend for two additional years the requirement that the effective parity price for the six basic commodities shall be the parity price computed under the old or new parity formula, whichever is higher. Currently, under section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, this requirement applies for 4 years beginning with January 1 1950. Under H. R. 8122, this requirement would extend for two more years through 1955. This change would affect only four of the six basic commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts—since, at the present time, the new parity price is higher for both rice and tobacco.

2. It would require the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops of the basic commodities to be supported at 90 percent of parity, except where producers have disapproved marketing quotas. This would have the effect of suspending temporarily the operation of the sliding-scale provisions of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 under which support for the basic commodities can range between 75 and 90 percent of parity. The level of support proposed by H. R. 8122 is the same level at which the Department has announced it will support the 1952 crops of the basic commodities.

The Nation today is confronted by an emergency calling for high-level agricultural production. We need favorable prices and adequate price protection to provide an economic climate favorable to high-level production. Both of these changes should help maintain high-level production of the basic commodities during the current emergency.

There appears to be considerable merit in delaying the shift from the old to the new parity in the case of the basic commodities during the present emergency. When the Agricultural Act of 1949 was approved in October 1949, there appeared to be a fair possibility that the gap between the old and new parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts (the four basic commodities on which new parity prices were lower than the old parity prices) would narrow during the 4-year period specified. This prospect was based on the assumption that the general level of prices received by farmers would continue to decline and that prices of wheat, corn, and cotton, buttressed by price support and production adjustment measures, would be at least as high, if not higher, in relation to parity than the general level of agricultural prices. These price prospects did not materialize to a large extent due to the emergency which arose with the outbreak of hostilities in Korea. Old parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts have been higher than the new parity prices all during the period since 1950. It also appears fairly definite that by the end of 1953 old parity prices will still be well above the new parity prices for wheat, corn, and peanuts. Under these circumstances, an additional period for readjustment is desirable. By extending this requirement for the use of the old or new parity price for a limited period of two additional years, we would merely be postponing the objective of reaching a single parity standard rather than abandoning it.

The provision in H. R. 8122 which would eliminate the sliding scale for the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops of basic commodities would be in accord with the President's recommendation to the Congress. The philosophy inherent in the sliding scale that farm production should be adjusted downward by decreasing the level of support provides farmers with the least protection when protection is most needed, and is neither a fair nor logical approach to the price-support problem. As the President pointed out in his Economic Report to the Congress on January 16, "the 'sliding scale' in existing price-support legislation has aroused concern in the minds of many farmers, who fear that their cooperation in expanding production to meet the present emergency might later result in serious losses to them. The Government's price-support operations obviously should further attainment of production objectives, and they should not penalize producers for their full and patriotic cooperation with the agricultural program. I therefore recommend

that the sliding-scale provisions of the present agricultural legislation be repealed for this purpose."

In an emergency situation such as the present when farmers are being asked to increase and maintain production, it seems unwise to permit a sharp drop in the price-support level for basic commodities. H. R. 8122 would help avoid this situation by continuing the old or new parity price through 1955, and by requiring the basic commodities to be supported at 90 percent of parity, except when producers have disapproved marketing quotas during this period.

The Department recommends that H. R. 8122 be approved.

In view of your request that this report be submitted immediately, we have not obtained from the Bureau of the Budget advice as to the relationship of this report to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

	*		*		*		*		*		*
SEC. 301 (a) (1)	*	*	*	*		*		*		*	
	*		*		*		*		*		*

(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the [four-year] six-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

TITLE I—BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to cooperators for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such crop, at a level not in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price of the commodity nor less than the level provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) as follows:

(a) For tobacco (except as otherwise provided herein), corn, wheat, and rice, if the supply percentage as of the beginning of the marketing year is:	The level of support shall be not less than the following percentage of the parity price:
Not more than 102.....	90
More than 102 but not more than 104.....	89
More than 104 but not more than 106.....	88
More than 106 but not more than 108.....	87
More than 108 but not more than 110.....	86
More than 110 but not more than 112.....	85
More than 112 but not more than 114.....	84
More than 114 but not more than 116.....	83
More than 116 but not more than 118.....	82
More than 118 but not more than 120.....	81
More than 120 but not more than 122.....	80
More than 122 but not more than 124.....	79
More than 124 but not more than 126.....	78
More than 126 but not more than 128.....	77
More than 128 but not more than 130.....	76
More than 130.....	75

	The level of support shall be not less than the following percentage of the parity price:
(b) For cotton and peanuts, if the supply percentage as of the beginning of the marketing year is:	
Not more than 108.....	90
More than 108 but not more than 110.....	89
More than 110 but not more than 112.....	88
More than 112 but not more than 114.....	87
More than 114 but not more than 116.....	86
More than 116 but not more than 118.....	85
More than 118 but not more than 120.....	84
More than 120 but not more than 122.....	83
More than 122 but not more than 124.....	82
More than 124 but not more than 125.....	81
More than 125 but not more than 126.....	80
More than 126 but not more than 127.....	79
More than 127 but not more than 128.....	78
More than 128 but not more than 129.....	77
More than 129 but not more than 130.....	76
More than 130.....	75

(c) For tobacco, if marketing quotas are in effect, the level of support shall be 90 per centum of the parity price.

(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

(1) if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such crop, the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1950 crop of any basic agricultural commodity for which marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect;

(2) if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such crop, the level of support to cooperators shall be not less than 80 per centum of the parity price for the 1951 crop of any basic agricultural commodity for which marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect;

(3) the level of price support to cooperators for any crop of a basic agricultural commodity, except tobacco, for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers shall be 50 per centum of the parity price of such commodity; and no price support shall be made available for any crop of tobacco for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers;

(4) the level of price support for corn to cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 75 per centum of the level of price support to cooperators in the commercial corn-producing area;

(5) price support may be made available to noncooperators at such levels, not in excess of the level of price support to cooperators, as the Secretary determines will facilitate the effective operation of the program.

(6) *the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.*

(e) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Act, section 2 of the Act of July 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 506), shall continue in effect.



Union Calendar No. 685

82^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 8122

[Report No. 2188]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 9, 1952

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill: which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 17, 1952

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

5 “(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this
6 section, the parity price for any basic agricultural com-
7 modity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning
8 January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price
9 computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the
10 Agricultural Act of 1949.”

11 SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949

1 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end
 2 of section 101 (d) thereof:

3 “(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90
 4 per centum of the parity price for the 1953, 1954, and 1955
 5 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to
 6 which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.”

Union Calendar No. 685

82nd CONGRESS
 2nd Session

H. R. 8122

[Report No. 2188]

A BILL

To continue the existing method of computing
 parity prices for basic agricultural commod-
 ities, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COOLEY

JUNE 9, 1952

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 17, 1952

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
 the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued June 20, 1952

For actions of June 19, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 107

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropri-	Fats and oils.....9	Purchasing.....6
ation bill.....1	Import control.....3	Soil conservation.....2
Appropriations.....5,19	Lands, reclamation.....16	Taxation.....14
Copper.....18	Personnel.....7,12,19	Trade, foreign.....9
Defense production,3,10,13	Price control.....15	Veterans' benefits.....8
Electrification.....11,17	Price support.....4,17	Water utilization.....2
Expenditures.....14		

HIGHLIGHTS: House sent agricultural appropriation bill to conference. House committee reported Poage soil-conservation aid bill. House debated defense production bill. House discussed price-support levels bill. Senate passed Army civil-functions appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Reps. Whitten, Hedrick, Marshall, Cannon, Andersen, Eoran, and Taber were appointed conferees on this bill, H. R. 7314 (p. 7749). Senate conferees were appointed June 6.

2. SOIL CONSERVATION; WATER UTILIZATION. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8243, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation (H. Rept. 2222)(p. 7790).

3. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Continued debate on H. R. 8210, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act (pp. 7754-88).

Agreed to a Sadlak amendment which denies any authority to limit the domestic consumption of any material in order to restrict total U. S. consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference after meeting requirements of national defense; by a 169-102 vote (pp. 7755-70).

Rejected, 25-105, a Boggs amendment to repeal Sec. 104, the import-control provision (pp. 7776-81). Also rejected, 30-86, a Multer amendment to exempt premium-priced commodities from Sec. 104 (pp. 7781-2).

4. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Cooley asked for consideration of H. R. 8122, to continue availability of the old parity formula and to postpone authority for the sliding scale on basic commodities, but after discussion Rep. Javits objected (pp. 7752-3).

SENATE

5. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 7268, Army-civil-functions appropriation bill. Sens. McKellar, Hayden, Russell, Ellender, Holland, Knowland,

Young, Cordon, and Thye were appointed conferees. Agreed to all committee amendments plus two additional amendments increasing flood control funds by \$700,000, and providing \$900,000 for investigation of the Niagara Redevelopment works. Rejected a Bridges motion to recommit the bill to committee with instructions for a 10% reduction, a Ferguson amendment to reduce funds for flood control by \$11,976,700 and, on points of order, a Monroney amendment providing for transfer of 2% of flood control funds to this Department for use in accordance with the Flood Control Act (pp. 7735, 7738-40), and Douglas amendment barring flood-control projects directly benefiting the lands involved unless the owner agrees to pay one-half of the cost (pp. 7710-9, 7721-43.)

Passed as reported H. R. 7216, D. C. appropriation bill for 1953. Conferees were appointed. (pp. 7743-4.)

6. PURCHASING. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7405, providing for a single defense supply cataloging system (S.Rept. 1796)(p. 7706).
7. PERSONNEL. Began consideration of S. 3061, to permit and assist Federal personnel including members of the Armed Forces, and their families to exercise their voting franchise, agreeing to all committee amendments, and making the bill Friday's unfinished business (pp. 7744-6).
8. VETERANS' BENEFITS. A Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee completed the markup of H. R. 7656, the Korean GI bill (p. D611).
9. FOREIGN TRADE. Received a Philippine Chamber of Commerce letter relating to the elimination of the 3 cents processing tax on coconut oil (p. 7704).
Received a Ponce (Puerto Rico) Chamber of Commerce petition urging repeal of the Andresen amendment to the Defense Production Act on the importation of oil, cheese and butter from other countries (p. 7704).
10. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Sen. Malone praised the House for eliminating the authority of the International Materials Conference from the Defense Production Act (pp. 7729-30).

BILLS INTRODUCED

1. ELECTRIFICATION. S. J. Res. 168, by Sen. Magnuson, authorizing an inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into certain practices and activities of private companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of electrical energy in interstate commerce; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 7706).
Remarks of author (pp. 7706-7.)
12. PERSONNEL. H. Res. 701, by Rep. McMillan, to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct a comparative study of the different kinds of employees' benefits available to persons in public and private employment; to Rules Committee (p. 7790). Remarks of author (pp. A4010-1.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Rep. McCormack inserted an AFL letter favoring price ceilings on fresh fruits and vegetables, and repeal of the so-called Harlong and Capchart amendments (pp. A4009-10).
14. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Gamble inserted a newspaper editorial favoring S. J. Res. 155, which would limit nonmilitary spending by the Federal Government to 5% of the estimated national income (p. A4015).

thority. However, the following provisions of the section provide that after the Commandant has indicated to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that a matter scheduled for hearing by the Joint Chiefs of Staff directly concerns the Marine Corps, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may refer that request on the part of the Commandant to the Secretary of Defense for a decision as to whether or not the matter in question does in his opinion directly concern the Marine Corps. And so the provision as drawn provides a system of checks and balances as between the Commandant on the one hand, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the other which, in the opinion of the House conferees, will insure that each will adhere to the principles enumerated and exercise the greatest of caution to insure that neither shall abuse the prerogatives of the other. In the final analysis the Congress is making an attempt to insure that matters of national defense at the level of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be decided on the basis of the broadest military experience available. Failure to implement this intent would produce most unfortunate results. The House conferees are confident that such results will not occur.

Section 3 of the conference agreement was an original provision in the House version but was absent in the Senate version. It merely repeals existing law which relates the strength of the Marine Corps to a percentage strength of the Navy. Having established the strength of the Marine Corps in section 1 of the conference agreement, there is no longer a necessity to relate the strength of the Marine Corps to the strength of the Navy. Therefore, the House and Senate conferees were in full agreement that the conference agreement should include the House provision in this respect.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the agreement that was reached on the important parts of this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the House is very interested in the decision which was reached by the conferees, I will briefly explain it to the House.

First. The United States Marine Corps within the Department of the Navy will be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and air wings and supporting units. The actual size of these units will be determined by the Congress through its appropriations for Marine Corps personnel.

Second. The numerical floor which was in the original House bill has been deleted.

Third. The ceiling of 400,000, which was in both the House and Senate bills, remains in the conference agreement, except in time of war or national emer-

gency declared by the Congress, when it would automatically be suspended.

Fourth. The result of the conference agreement will establish for the first time a statutory division organizational structure for the Marine Corps.

With reference to the status of the Commandant and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the conference agreement provides:

First. That the Commandant will indicate to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when a matter before the Joint Chiefs of Staff directly concerns the Marine Corps.

Second. That when such a matter is under discussion by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commandant, unless overruled by the Secretary of Defense, will attend such meeting and present his case, at which time he will have coequal status with members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except for membership on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Third. This means that the Commandant must receive a copy of the agenda of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; that he must have staff representation in appropriate numbers and appropriate levels of the Joint Chiefs of Staff supporting organizations; and that he will not attend any meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except on matters directly concerning the Marine Corps, and that his decision that a matter directly concerns the Marine Corps may be overruled by the Secretary of Defense, in which event he would not attend. It is obvious that the Joint Chiefs of Staff may ask the advice on the Commandant on other matters, in which event the Commandant would attend the meeting for the sole purpose of giving his advice and not participating in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the House well knows, I have long been keenly interested in the enactment of legislation which would fix the size and the status of the Marine Corps in our national defense structure. Many of us have worked long and hard to bring this about, not because we have any particular interest in the Marine Corps as such but because we so earnestly believe that such legislation is a primary defense need.

The conference report now before us is the culmination of these efforts. I am pleased to have been able to contribute, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and one of the conferees, to the final agreement. In reaching this agreement I have been obliged to yield on some very definite convictions I have as to what should be the status of the Marine Corps. But this legislation is better than none at all, and I believe is an improvement over the bill passed by the other body.

You will recall that the bill passed by the House provided that the Marine Corps Commandant shall be a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I still hold to that opinion. The Senate bill, on the other hand, provided that he shall be a consultant to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Under the Senate version the

Commandant would, to all intents and purposes be in virtually the same status he now is. He may or may not be consulted.

The important thing is to make certain that the Marine Corps Commandant has a definite voice in all matters which affect or concern the Marine Corps. To accomplish this the Commandant must have opportunity to determine for himself whether a matter being considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff does or does not affect or concern the Marine Corps.

The language agreed upon by the conference committee does not give the Commandant any official status as a regular or associate member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but it has the merit of making certain that he is advised of every matter to be considered by them and that he has the opportunity to express his views on it where he feels that the Marine Corps is concerned.

This is indeed a distinct improvement over the existing situation. And, as set forth in the statement on the part of the House managers, it is understood by all of us that in carrying out this law the Marine Corps Commandant will have representation on the subordinate echelons of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Unless he has such representation the Marine Corps Commandant cannot possibly have a real voice in the considerations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Not infrequently decisions are made in the lower echelons, such as by the Joint Strategic Survey Committee, the Joint Strategic Plans Committee, and so forth, which do not become part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff official agenda. And yet these decisions may very vitally concern the Marine Corps.

We fully expect that in carrying out this law the services will make certain that the Marine Corps has a voice in all stages of the Joint Chiefs of Staff deliberations, and that the Marine Corps itself have complete opportunity to determine for itself whether it is affected or concerned in any way. As an individual member of the Armed Services Committee, and I am sure this is the attitude of the entire committee, I intend to do what I can to see that this intent is carried out.

Just a word as to the size of the Marine Corps. By this legislation we are seeking to guarantee that we have a highly integrated, mobile striking force in readiness for any emergency that may arise. The Senate bill provided for four full-strength divisions and four full-strength air wings, with a ceiling of 400,000. The House bill provided for three full-strength divisions and three full-strength air wings, with both a numerical floor and ceiling. The House bill had the protective advantage of definitely fixing a floor.

That is the important feature retained in the conference report agreement. While it sets the size at three combat divisions and three air wings, it does not stipulate the strength numerically except as to the ceiling. But it does stipulate a floor of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

While this conference report may not be what we want or would like to have, it

is nonetheless a distinct improvement over the existing situation. I believe it will add materially to our national defense. It being the primary responsibility of the Congress to determine the kind, type, and nature of defense we shall have, by this legislation we are making such a determination, and I believe the President should approve it. If the President should for any reason veto this bill, he will be arrogating to himself a constitutional prerogative of the Congress.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, under the outline as now given by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, does the Marine member now have a right to vote under the conference report?

Mr. VINSON. The Commandant of the Marine Corps will have whatever rights the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have, whether it is voting or anything else, with coequal status, when matters of direct concern to the Marine Corps are before the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is that any different than the set-up today?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; entirely different. Today he is not on coequal status; he does not attend the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff unless he is invited to express his opinion or give advice.

Mr. KEARNEY. Unless he is invited.

Mr. VINSON. Unless he is invited.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my understanding of the agreement reached in conference is that in addition to establishing a maximum strength, that a statutory floor has also been placed under the agreement.

Mr. VINSON. No numerical floor is in it. It is left entirely to the Congress to maintain the three-combat-division strength, three combat air wings and other units sets out in the conference report, at such strength as it may deem advisable.

Mr. JACKSON of California. But the House bill said it should not be less than three full strength combat divisions and three full strength air wings; is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. The actual size of the units will be determined by the Congress through its appropriations. While the conference agreement leaves it to the Congress to determine by the appropriations it makes what strength of the Marine Corps shall be, it cannot exceed 400,000. But we have said that the Marine Corps shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions, three air wings and other units. As to whether or not they will be maintained at full strength it will be entirely up to the Congress when the Marine Corps appropriations are considered.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I think this conference report falls far short of the intent of the House.

Mr. VINSON. It may be true, but I will say, Mr. Speaker, it takes the agreement of both bodies to get a bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not

intend to object, I am very much dissatisfied with this bill, although I recognize the fact that you have had quite a time getting what you did get out of the conference.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. However, for the record I want to make sure that it is the intent of the Congress that the floor shall be three combat divisions and three air wings?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. The statement of House managers goes into details and states the intent of the House conferees, so that there will be no doubt as to what the House conferees intended.

Mr. ARENDS. There will be no misunderstanding as to what the Congress is thinking about.

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the statement of the managers on the part of the House is very lengthy and has already been printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

METHOD OF COMPUTING PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman explain this bill and just what it does.

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to do so Mr. Speaker.

The bill continues the existing method of computing parity for basic agricultural commodities for a period of 2 years. It has another provision which continues the 90-percent price support program for two additional years on the basic agricultural commodities, when the producers of such commodities have not disapproved the marketing quotas.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the Senate passed a similar bill?

Mr. COOLEY. The Senate committee has reported favorably a bill containing one of the provisions contained in this bill, the one which deals with new and old parity formula which is in the act of 1949. The House Committee

on Agriculture gave very careful consideration to this measure and had extended hearings. My recollection is that the bill was unanimously reported, and it is considered urgent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In view of the urgency of this legislation, I will not object at this time to the consideration of the bill, but I think for the future it would be advisable to have more discussion on a measure of this importance so that the Members can understand it, and also so that those on the outside who might be interested will have the benefit of the real purpose and intent of the legislation.

I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to object at this time, and I want to serve notice to that effect on the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman withhold his objection?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from New York is going to object, it would appear there is nothing to gain by further discussion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the objection at this time, but I will reserve the right to object in order to get an explanation of the measure.

Mr. COOLEY. It may be that some member of the committee can clarify the situation, and give the gentleman from New York such information as he may desire concerning this measure. It is considered very important. Prices are now being supported at 90 percent of parity, and this is actually not going to materially change the situation for the current year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, that is entirely up to the Speaker as to whether the Speaker will afford time for adequate discussion. It seems to me this is a basic change in agricultural policy, which is the law, and therefore I shall be constrained to object unless the Speaker will afford adequate time for a complete explanation.

Mr. COOLEY. I will give you a complete explanation. The gentleman stated that this constituted a drastic change. It is not a drastic change. It is a continuation of the policy now in operation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from New York that this is merely a continuation of the present 90 percent program and prevents supports on our basics from going down possibly to 75 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If it were not for this, our prices may go down materially due to the sliding scale as provided by law.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly right. If the gentleman from New York will only stop to realize that all his Republican colleagues on the committee are utterly in favor of the measure, and thoroughly understand it. There is nothing complicated about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will not object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question, if I may, to the chairman of the committee. Personally, I do not think the measure now before us goes far enough. As the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture knows, I have introduced a bill calling for 100 percent parity. The chairman will recall that he has promised me he will hold hearings on my measure as soon as feasible. As I understand the present bill, it will continue for a 2-year period—90 percent of parity on certain selected agricultural products whereas if the gentleman from New York objects, it means there is a good possibility we will go back to the sliding scale which will reduce parity payments on these products below the present 90 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. That bill, of course, will be considered at the proper time, but it will not be affected in any way by this bill because this is a continuation of the 90-percent program which is in effect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the chairman of the committee? Is it not a fact that if this bill is not passed, then the law will be in effect as to a sliding parity from 75 to 90 percent, and if this bill is passed, for the next 2 years, it is fixed at 90 percent? Is that not a fact?

Mr. COOLEY. The situation is that unless we pass this bill, the Secretary of Agriculture could put into operation the sliding scale. I can say to the gentleman from New York that frankly I have no fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the sliding scale at this particular time, when the Nation is making such unprecedented demands on the farmers of this Nation to step up production.

Mr. JAVITS. This does change the law in that regard?

Mr. COOLEY. It only extends the 90-percent program two additional years.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENDING VOTING RIGHTS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 513)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, June 19, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I urge that the Congress give early and favorable attention to the measures now pending before it to enable the men and women in our armed services to exercise their right to vote. Close to a million members of our armed services may be unable to cast their votes this year unless the Congress acts on these matters before adjournment.

On March 28, in a message to the Congress, I recommended that certain steps be taken to facilitate the exercise of the franchise by our service men and service women, and by certain Federal personnel serving overseas. These recommendations were based on a careful study made by an expert committee of the American Political Science Association. A bill to effect improvements in existing law, in accordance with these recommendations, was introduced as H. R. 7571 by Representative McCORMACK in the House and as S. 3061 by Senator GREEN in the Senate.

The study made by the committee of the American Political Science Association pointed out the obstacles to soldier voting that are presented by the laws of many of our States. The committee recommended prompt remedial action by these States, and special Federal action, for this year only, to aid service men and women from States that fail to take action to improve their laws before November.

In a letter to me on April 30, 1952, which I transmitted to the House Committee on Administration, the Secretary of Defense described the efforts he was making to encourage the States with inadequate legislation to improve their laws, but concluded that since the majority of the States in this category would not convene their legislatures in 1952, the prospects for further State action this year were not bright.

There is another important reason why Congress should take early action. The basic legislative affirmation in our Federal laws of the right of service people to vote is contained in two provisions of the servicemen's voting law of 1946, which are effective only in time of war. Since the Japanese Peace Treaty came into effect on April 28, 1952, thereby terminating the state of war, these provisions, together with other war and emergency powers, have been temporarily extended from time to time by the Congress, on the last occasion to June 30. However, the pending measure for the permanent continuation of some of these war and emergency powers—House Joint Resolution 477—does not include these provisions affirming the right of members of our armed services to vote. Therefore, unless action is taken on H. R. 7571 and S. 3061, the very declaration of the right of our soldiers to vote will disappear from the Federal statutes. When we have

soldiers overseas defending the cause of freedom it is unthinkable that we should go backward instead of forward in enabling them to exercise the rights which all citizens possess.

In addition to enunciating the basic rights of our service people to vote, H. R. 7571 makes a series of recommendations for State action; prescribes certain steps for Federal agencies to follow, particularly with respect to postcard applications for State ballots; provides for a temporary Federal ballot for use in those States which do not give service people an adequate opportunity to vote; and contains a number of important miscellaneous provisions, such as those making voting matter postage free, and protecting against fraud and undue influence in voting in the Armed Forces.

All these provisions are important if we want our service people to exercise the rights they are defending for us. I hope the Congress will take prompt action to pass this vital legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to clear up, for the benefit of my colleagues and anyone else interested, any questions as to why I did not vote for the bill H. R. 7800. In the first place, Members of the House must realize that by the time my name was called on the record vote, the bill had carried with an overwhelming majority; therefore my vote, which was merely a protest, could not keep the beneficiaries of the social-security system from reaping the meager benefits which the bill provided.

I have no desire to criticize the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who undoubtedly did their best under the circumstances. However, from my own constituents who are directly affected I have received many complaints, and in responding to them I have promised the quickest possible remedial action.

I was very much disappointed that in programming H. R. 7800 there was only 40 minutes allowed for debate and no opportunity was given for amendments. I wanted to make clear the feelings of my people in regard to some of the features of the law. The increase provided is very meager indeed. It might provide a bare existence if the beneficiary could hold some kind of a job in order to draw the amount necessary to keep body and soul together. In some cases the \$70 limit provided by the bill might do it. In many others it cannot. Since the beneficiaries have contributed to their own social-security fund, I see no reason why they should not be permitted to employ themselves gainfully either without any limit or at least to the extent of \$100. I believe the House should

consider under certain circumstances lowering the retirement age to 60 for men and 55 for women, with suitable adjustments in benefits.

I have many complaints from women as to the inequities and the differences in payments to a widow and to a widower.

I have found in my district, which is largely agricultural, that there is a great deal of confusion as to just who is and who is not covered. It would be much the best for the farm workers if language in connection with the agriculture coverage could be clarified and any doubt eliminated as to whether there would be benefits eventually returned to the employee.

The objection of housewives to collection of taxes covering domestics may, to some, seem a trivial matter. However, I believe that it is by no means trivial, and the constant nagging of this thorn in the flesh could be eliminated to the advantage of the entire social-security program.

I voted with regret not to suspend the rules to pass the bill as it now stands. If it could be liberalized, or if we could at least air our opinions and state the cases for our constituents, I would feel very differently about it. Under the present circumstances, I cannot give them their day in court.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD of yesterday on page 7699 in line 5 of my remarks under the heading "Tribute to Bob DOUGHTON." The figure "36" should read "361."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the permanent RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER POWER

(Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to include at this point in the RECORD a short letter to the President.)

(The letter is as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1952.
The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was greatly disappointed, as I know you were, with the vote in the Senate recommitting the St. Lawrence seaway bill. This means that this great project is dead for this year.

As you know, in 1948 New York State applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to develop the power jointly with the Province of Ontario.

Now, it seems to me that the logical thing to do is to allow New York State and the Province of Ontario to jointly develop this power. This would not cost the Federal taxpayer a penny. It would give New York

State and New England much needed power which is now going to waste. As I understand the situation, it needs the approval of the Federal Power Commission and the International Joint Commission. It would not need action by the Congress. The Province of Ontario and the State of New York can then construct the dam jointly and develop the power. New York State is ready to go ahead and the Province of Ontario has already given its approval.

I respectfully urge, sir, that you use your Executive power and influence with these two commissions to have this project approved immediately so that New York State and the Province of Ontario can proceed. I might add that New York State will charge enough for the power so that the project will be self-liquidating.

Respectfully yours,
CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
Member of Congress.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S HAND IN OUR AIR POWER REDUCTION

(Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. REECE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, I secured permission for my colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. As the extension was written up on page A3347 of the RECORD it appears as though it were my extension. I merely secured permission for the gentleman from Rhode Island to extend his remarks.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Aandahl	Buckley	Dawson
Abernethy	Burdick	Dingell
Albert	Butler	Evins
Allen, La.	Carlyle	Fenton
Anfuso	Carnahan	Frazier
Bates, Ky.	Celler	Gore
Beall	Chatham	Hébert
Beckworth	Clemente	Heffernan
Bender	Cole, N. Y.	Herter

Hope	Pickett	Stanley
Kilday	Poulson	Steed
McVey	Powell	Stigler
Mack, Ill.	Prouty	Sutton
Morris	Reed, Ill.	Tackett
Murdock	Richards	Thomas
Murphy	Sabath	Welch
Norblad	Sasser	Wickersham
Patman	Scott,	Wigglesworth
Patten	Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Ind.
Phillips	Shafer	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8210) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8210, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first section of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time so that I might ask the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee a question. On page 28 of the committee report on House bill H. R. 8210, there is a paragraph under the caption "Certain technical violations," which reads as follows:

Your committee has received several complaints concerning the general ceiling price regulation affecting lumber distributors in southern areas with respect to which your committee believes relief must be afforded. The general ceiling price regulation was issued in January 1951 shortly after the general price freeze. The provisions of the regulation as it affected such distributors was ambiguous in many respects, and attempts were immediately made to bring this to the attention of the agency. However, a period of a year elapsed before a new regulation was issued correcting and clarifying the matters complained of. During this period it is the understanding of your committee there were some technical violations of the general ceiling price regulation of a nonwillful character. Such technical violations would not be violations of the order now in effect and but for the long period of time it took to issue the current order would probably never have occurred. It is not the intention of your committee to condone willful violations of any price regulation or order in this instance or any other. But in view of the circumstances of these cases it is the opinion of your committee that there should be no prosecution of technical violations, which were nonwillful, and which would not constitute any violation of the order currently in effect.

This paragraph points out that the provision of the regulation as it affected

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued June 25, 1952

For actions of June 24, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 111

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	2,3,8	Flood control.....	20,23,27	Price supports.....	9
Budgeting.....	6	Forestry.....	12,20	Purchasing.....	11
Claims.....	8	Lands, public.....	12	Reclamation.....	10,16,23
Defense production....	14,21	Lands, reclamation.....	27	Soil conservation....	15,20
Education.....	24	Legislative program.....	7	Taxation.....	16
Electrification.....	16	Management improvement....	4	Tuna imports.....	1
Expenditures.....	16	Parity.....	22	Veterans' benefits....	5,26
Extension work.....	24	Personnel.....	13,19,25	Wage control.....	17
Farm program.....	27	Price control.....	17	Weed control.....	18

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate defeated tuna-fish imports bill. House Rules Committee cleared price-support levels bill. Senate committee reported State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill. House received conference report on Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. House cleared Collbran reclamation bill to President. House committee ordered reported Bosone small reclamation projects bill.

SENATE

1. TUNA-FISH IMPORTS. By a 32-43 vote, defeated H. R. 5693, to impose a tariff on tuna-fish imports (pp. 8031-48).
2. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 7239 (S. Rept. 1807)(p. 8026). The "Daily Digest" states: "As approved, the bill authorizes expenditures of \$1,015,016,735, a decrease from the House-passed bill of \$1,906,996. The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for these appropriations was \$1,243,136,809." (p. D631.)
3. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. This bill, H. R. 7176, was made the unfinished business (p. 8059). Sens. Douglas and Hayden submitted various amendments which they intend to propose to the bill (p. 8029).
4. MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau a report on management improvements and employee awards pursuant to Title X of the Classification Act of 1949; to Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service (pp. 8023, 8088).
5. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Sen. Ferguson spoke in favor of several amendments to H. R. 7656, the GI bill for veterans of the Korean conflict (pp. 8027-9).
6. BUDGETING. Sen. McClellan spoke in favor of S. 913, to provide for a joint budget committee (pp. 8030-1).

7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Majority Leader, in reply to a question as to whether Congress would recess or adjourn, stated: "We are driving for adjournment on the 5th of July, and we hope that we shall reach adjournment by that time." He further stated, however, "I am not making any promises." (p. 8049.)

HOUSE

8. APPROPRIATIONS. House conferees submitted conference report on H. R. 6854, Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill for 1953 (H. Rept. 2284) (p. 8064). Received the President's letter transmitting a supplemental appropriation estimate of \$868,491.17 for the payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States (H. Doc. 517) (p. 8087).

9. PRICE SUPPORTS. The Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of H. R. 8122, to continue the present method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities and continue 90%-of-parity price supports (p. 8085).

10. RECLAMATION. Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 2813, to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance of the Collbran reclamation project, Colo. (pp. 8068-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 6163, providing for irrigation works in connection with the Chief Joseph Dam project, Columbia River, Wash., and H. R. 7084, establishing a small reclamation projects fund (p. D634).

Rep. Mitchell spoke in favor of the Hells Canyon Dam (Idaho) and he claimed the Idaho Power Company is opposing this project through large-scale advertising, and that the costs of this advertising is borne by the consumers (pp. 8069-71).

11. PURCHASING. Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 7405, to provide for a single supply cataloging and standardization system for the Defense Department. One amendment provides for coordination with GSA in its cataloging efforts so as to prevent unnecessary duplication. (pp. 8063-41.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

12. FORESTRY. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 8341, providing for the acquisition of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and cinder deposits on national forest lands (p. D634).

13. PERSONNEL. The Judiciary Committee rereferred to subcommittee for further study S. 2545, permitting the advance of travel expenses and subsistence to Government employees by one agency for the convenience of another (p. D634).

14. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Extension of remarks by Rep. Clements criticizing House action in adopting the Talle and other amendments to the defense production bill which Clements claimed eliminated "our program of economic stabilization," and he inserted Economic Stabilizer Putnam's recent statement opposing these amendments (pp. 8065-6).

15. SOIL CONSERVATION. The "Daily Digest" states that the Rules Committee "deferred action on a rule for H. R. 8243, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation" (p. D635).

16. RECLAMATION; ELECTRIFICATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Angell spoke in favor of Government reclamation and electrification projects in the Pacific Northwest, and against high taxation and the high rate of Government spending (pp. 8076-83).

reductions in spending. I recall one week I voted to reduce expenditures by \$5,380,000,000, things which I felt were unnecessary expenditures and which could be eliminated during this period of time through which we are passing. In all, I have voted to reduce spending by a sum exceeding \$12,250,000,000—a sum sufficient to balance the budget and leave some little surplus. I am sure that some results are seen from my effort, but our work must go on. We must resolve that America shall continue solvent and at the same time continue our great progress.

H. R. 8315 AND H. R. 8316

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 8315 and H. R. 8316.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 704, Rept. No. 2287), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMPUTING PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. LYLE), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 705, Rept. No. 2288), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. That after general debate which

shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TRIBES, BANDS, AND GROUPS OF INDIANS

Mr. DELANEY (at the request of Mr. LYLE), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 706, Rept. No. 2289), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 698, Rept. No. 2290), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with particular reference to (1) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has performed its functions of studying the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians to determine their qualifications for management of their own affairs without further supervision of the Federal Government; (2) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has fulfilled its obligations of trust as the agency of the Federal Government charged with the guardianship of Indian property; (3) the adequacy of law and regulations to assure the faithful performance of trust in the exchange, lease, or sale of surface or subsurface interests in or title to real property or disposition of personal property of Indian wards.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, including (1) a list of the tribes, bands, or groups of Indians found to be qualified for full management of their own affairs; (2) legislative proposals designed to promote the earliest practicable termination of all Federal supervision and control over Indians; (3) a listing of functions now carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which may be discontinued or transferred to other agencies of the Federal Government or to the States; (4) names of States where further operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be discontinued; (5) recommended legislation for removal of legal disability of Indians by reason of guardianship by the Federal Government; (6) findings concerning transactions involving the exchange, lease, or sale of lands or interests in lands belonging to Indian wards, with specific findings as to such transactions in the State of Oregon; (7) recommendations to the Attorney General for action by the Department of Justice if the committee finds any violation of trust in the disposition of property of Indian wards; (8) recommended legislation designed to achieve faithful performance by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the obligations of guardianship for the benefit of Indian wards.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 707, Rept. No. 2291), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6544) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. LYLE (at the request of Mr. Cox), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 708, Rept. No. 2292), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1203) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. SIEMINSKI), for the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

PRICE AND WAGE STABILIZATION

(Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the most convincing evidence of the need for continuation of the price and wage stabilization provisions of the Defense Production Act was made public on Thursday, June 19, by the Labor Department when it published the current cost-of-living index.

If anyone has any doubts as to the need for continuation of price control, he only need note that the cost of living in the United States today is near the all-time peak in our history.

A great many critics of direct economic controls have argued that the best way to bring prices down is by increased production. Over the long pull certainly increased production is an effective brake on prices. But what is the present situation?

Today we have a higher output of food per capita than ever before and yet food prices are continuing to rise. We have built new homes at the rate of about a million a year and rents continue to go up.

Taking our production as a whole our output in 1952 bids fair to outdistance anything that we have accomplished in the past. This year we will have a greater gross national product than ever before.

Certainly if we could say that increased production were the whole answer or the only answer we should be

seeing prices on the way down. Instead, we see them rising. This is sound evidence that unless we have direct controls the sky may well be the limit.

What does the cost-of-living index show? It shows that the costs of fuel, food, rent, miscellaneous services all have been on the upgrade in recent months. Only the costs of apparel and house furnishings have been dropping.

The meaning of these changes in the price situation ought to be pretty clear to all of us. Why have the people been putting off the purchase of apparel and house furnishings? Simply because these are things that the people can go without when they are pinched by rising costs of other commodities.

It is pretty hard to break the habit of eating. And there is no way to avoid the payment of the landlord or the utility bill. Because these are essentials, because they are the things that the consumer has to have each and every day, they have been going up in price.

Why have consumers been cutting down on apparel and home furnishings? Is it because we need less clothing or less furniture than we did last year? Certainly not. The answer is simply that the grocer and the butcher are taking so much of the average family's income that there is nothing left over for the other things that the consumer needs.

There has been a great deal of talk of soft markets in textiles. Almost without exception this industry has said that there no longer is need for price controls because its products are slow-moving and selling way below ceilings.

But the industries that are crying "soft market" are making a terrible mistake in seeking a solution to their merchandising problems by the elimination of price controls. Instead they should be urging stronger controls over the prices both of food and of rents. The textile industry can only look forward to additional trouble if the family grocery bill and the family rent bill is forced ever higher and higher.

The manufacturers of appliances and of automobiles likewise have been experiencing sales resistance on the part of their normal customers. Is this because the market has been saturated? Far from it. The answer is simply that high prices have put so many people on a hand-to-mouth basis. With cost-of-living items at their present levels that average consumer just doesn't have the margin for the other things that he needs.

What is the answer? Is it to relax restrictions, to relax controls? If that were the answer these various industries should be enjoying their greatest prosperity. Instead they are bemoaning slow sales. No; that is not the answer. The answer is to keep a firm rein on the cost-of-living items so that the average consumer will have a little left over after the grocer, the butcher, and the landlord have been paid. The answer is to strengthen controls so that all segments of our economy will share in this great output that we are turning out this year. The answer is for fair and equitable prices all across the board which can

only be achieved if we keep a firm hand on the economy as a whole.

When the cost of living is at about the highest peak in the history of this country—and this at the very time when we have maximum production—we should be exhausting every effort to find ways and means to strengthen all phases of our economic stabilization program.

ZARUBIN, PANYUSHKIN, AND GROMYKO; WHERE WERE THEY?

(Mr. SIEMINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the nights of June 21, 1941, June 25, 1950, September 12, 1950, and yesterday when the Yalu power plants were blown up, where were Messrs. Zarubin, Panyushkin, Gromyko, and Gerhard Eisler? What did their reports show?

For that matter, where were Berea, Molotov, Vishinsky, and Malik?

Strange, is not it, how they have exposed the Politburo so often with its red flannels showing.

And what were those high jinks 5 nights ago at Dairen and Port Arthur? Some big Soviet fish involved, no? The moon was out. So are the power plants.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. CELLER in three instances.

Mr. PRICE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI in three instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. GOLDEN and to include an article prepared by Mr. Tom Dale, of the Soil Conservation Department, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include an article.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include an article by Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) to extend his remarks immediately following the action taken on H. R. 7405.

Mr. ANDERSON of California to extend his remarks immediately following those of Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. SHEEHAN in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include an article on an evaluation of our foreign policy, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed 2 pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$357.

Mr. HILLINGS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. FISHER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued July 1, 1952

For actions of June 30, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 116

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....3	Housing.....20	Public-land laws.....13
Appropriations...2,16,24,30	Immigration.....23	Puerto Rico.....9
Buildings and grounds..3,10	Import control.....11	Reclamation.....29
Chemicals in foods.....6	Insect laboratory.....3	Research.....3
Claims.....16	Investigations.....14	Retirement.....28
Crop estimates.....15	Lands, transfer.....5	Sea water.....3
Defense production....24,31	Loans.....20	Taxation.....19
Economic Stabilization	Nominations.....17	Tobacco allotments.....4
Agency.....24	Personnel.....21,28	Trade, foreign.....12
Electrification.....27	Price control.....24	Veterans' benefits.....8,26
Emergency powers.....7	Price maintenance....18,25	Water utilization.....3
Expenditures.....19,22	Price support.....1	Weather control.....3

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed price-support levels bill. House concurred in Senate amendments to sea-water research bill. Ready for President. Conferees agreed to file reports on agricultural and independent-offices appropriation bills. House passed bill reducing minimum allotments on burley tobacco. House passed bill to combine two insect-research stations. House committee reported weather-control study bill.

HOUSE

- 1. PRICE SUPPORTS.** Passed without amendment H. R. 8122, which would continue dual parity for two additional years (through 1955) and would continue 90%-of-parity price supports on basic commodities for a similar period; by a 207-121 vote (pp. 8690-705). Rejected, 21-67, a Javits amendment to eliminate the dual-parity provision (pp. 8698-9). Rejected, 43-62, a Hays of Ohio amendment to eliminate peanuts from the 90%-loan provision (pp. 8699-704). Rejected, 79-165, a Javits motion to recommit the bill (pp. 8704-5).
- 2. APPROPRIATIONS.** The conferees on H. R. 7314, the agricultural appropriation bill, agreed to file a report thereon (p. D670).
The conferees on H. R. 7072, the independent offices appropriation bill, agreed to file a second (revised) conference report, (p. D670). Earlier in the day Rep. Sheppard was appointed as a substitute conferee for Rep. Gore (p. 8669).
House conferees were appointed on H. R. 7216, the D. C. appropriation bill; H. R. 7313, the legislative appropriation bill; and H. R. 7268, the Army civil functions appropriation bill (pp. 8667, 8670, 8688). Senate conferees have been appointed on these bills.
- 3. RESEARCH.** Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 6578, to authorize the Interior Department, in cooperation with other public and private agencies, to conduct research and demonstrations on the use of sea water for irrigation, etc. (pp. 8667-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 2225, to provide for a study and evaluation of weather control (H. Rept. 2360) (p. 8713).

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 218, to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants (H. Rept. 2359) (p. 8713).

Passed as reported H. R. 7952, to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of E&PQ at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif. (p. 8674).

4. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. Passed as reported H. R. 8170, to permit burley tobacco farm acreage allotments to be reduced to a minimum of 7/10 acre, provided that no allotment of 1 acre or less may be reduced more than 1/10 acre per year (pp. 8674-5).
5. LAND TRANSFER. Passed without amendment S. 2603, to authorize return to Oregon, for fish-hatchery use, a 2-acre tract which had previously been donated by that State for USDA use (p. 8674). This bill will now be sent to the President.
6. CHEMICALS IN FOODS. Received a report from the Delaney Committee (H. Rept. 2356) (p. 8713). The "Daily Digest" states: "In the report tribute is paid to the food industry, stating that the industry is entitled to considerable credit for the progress of research in the field of nutrition, and that this has resulted in an improvement in the health and nutritional status of millions. The committee stated, however, that the evidence had convinced it that the public is nevertheless in need of additional protection against small, irresponsible elements, as well as against the possible inadvertent mistakes of reputable food processors and premature enthusiasms of chemical manufacturers." (p. D669.)
7. EMERGENCY POWERS. The conferees on H. J. Res. 477, to continue various emergency war powers, agreed to file a report (p. D670).
8. VETERANS' BENEFITS. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 7656, the GI Bill of Rights for veterans of the Korean conflict (p. 8667). Senate conferees have been appointed.
9. PUERTO RICO. Agreed to the conference report on H. J. Res. 430, approving the Puerto Rican constitution (p. 8669).
10. BUILDINGS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. J. Res. 393, authorizing Government buildings and grounds to be used in connection with the 1953 inauguration (pp. 8669-70). This bill will now be sent to the President.
11. IMPORT CONTROLS. Rep. Andresen gave his analysis of the changes made by the conferees in the import-control provision of S. 2594, the defense production bill (pp. 8672-3).
12. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Smith, Miss., said the "Buy-American" policy is a "costly fallacy" (pp. 8705-8).
13. PUBLIC-LAND LAWS. Rep. Bentsen urged that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee prepare a proposed revision of the public-land laws instead of having a commission to perform this task (pp. 8710-12).
14. INVESTIGATIONS. Agreed, as reported, to H. Res. 263, providing \$150,000 additional for investigations of the Expenditures Committee (p. 8712).

Calendar No. 1916

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 8122

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 1 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952

Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

AN ACT

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjust-
4 ment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

5 “(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this
6 section, the parity price for any basic agricultural com-
7 modity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning
8 January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price
9 computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the
10 Agricultural Act of 1949.”

11 SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949

H. R. 8122

AN ACT

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

JULY 1 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952
Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

be appropriated not to exceed the sum of \$9,857,000."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "to" and insert ", 271, 273, and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out section 2.

Page 2, line 8, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "\$9,857,000" and insert "\$7,700,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House authorizes an additional expenditure of \$7,700,000 to complete a project in Philadelphia which will be known as Independence National Park. Around Philadelphia we call it the Independence Mall project. It will provide for a beautiful park to be built in front of the historical buildings which consist of Independence Hall, Carpenter's Hall, and many other famous sites where the Declaration of Independence was drawn by the founding fathers of this Nation, and where the Continental Congress met.

This is a joint project between the Federal Government and the State of Pennsylvania. The State of Pennsylvania has already started its part of the demolition, and two square blocks of the city facing Independence Hall have already been torn down. I do not believe there is any objection on the part of anyone to this great project. It is long past due.

I might say that as the city grew a great many buildings were constructed around Independence Hall. The fire underwriters call it the fire belt of Philadelphia, and we really fear that if a fire should break out around these historical buildings and a substantial wind were blowing from the river it might take Independence Hall and the other buildings with it.

I want to pay particular tribute to my colleagues from Philadelphia who appeared before the committee considering this bill and who worked so arduously to have it reported out.

I also want to say to the Members of this House that this is an American bill for all Americans. I hope that if any Member of this body should have the opportunity to visit Philadelphia during the coming adjournment or recess that he or she will take the opportunity to visit the site of this park.

It is a project to be proud of and I am sure that this beautiful mall will be visited by millions of children as well as adults upon completion. This expenditure as set forth in the bill will enable us to really isolate the buildings, build a beautiful park around them, and give us a real place for visitors to come to Philadelphia and see this historical site.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would this park be adjacent to the building or close to the building where Congress met originally?

Mr. CHUDOFF. All these buildings are practically contiguous to each other; they are either in the same block or within a block of each other. The building where Thomas Jefferson helped draw the Declaration of Independence will be included.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It will serve as a memorial to the Cradle of Liberty of the United States.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Definitely; that is what we are trying to do, and we are also trying to see to it that the buildings are not destroyed by any conflagration.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to express my appreciation of the fact that not only are we preserving one of the cradles of liberty from fire and the ravages of time, but we are also impressing upon America some of the lessons of history that are so badly needed at this time.

I want to say to the gentleman and to all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have taken part in sponsoring this legislation that we recognize and appreciate the great portion of the cost that Pennsylvania itself is bearing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I shall be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very strong for this bill, and I would not want to inject any note that would mar the very pleasant observations made about Liberty Hall, but I notice the phrase "Cradle of Liberty" was used. While we Bostonians have no objections in the least to the use of the word "cradle" in reference to any building that had anything to do with the Revolutionary War, we must keep the record clear that the real and the first Cradle of Liberty is Faneuil Hall in Boston.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend the majority leader, that the official name of the building there is Independence Hall; so we call it the Cradle of Liberty. Of course, I give due credit to Boston, but when you come to the cooperative movement to make a great country in this hemisphere, it really occurred in Philadelphia, in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will not get into a discussion of historical contributions except I want to keep the record clear that the hall that is known as the Cradle of Liberty is located in Boston. I am not at all minimizing the great importance of these buildings in Philadelphia, and I am giving full faith and credit to all the kind things that have been said and deservedly said about Independence Hall, but the Cradle of Liberty is located in Boston.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in listening to the colloquy in which the gentleman from Massachusetts extolled the virtues of Faneuil Hall, may I say just a word in the defense of Pennsylvania's Independence Hall.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. First of all, the gentleman from Massachusetts made no statement that calls for any defense. Explanation toward compatibility or reconcilability or anything like that would be in order. But I assure the gentleman nothing I said calls for any defense because if there was I would be defending the great contributions made by Philadelphia.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. When that unfortunate remark was made, I was going to answer it, but the majority leader is much smarter than I am, so he got in there first. I would hate to have anything in the Record that Philadelphia is the cradle of liberty, because hundreds of thousands of children have been brought up in this country to believe that Faneuil Hall is the cradle of liberty in this country.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may all be fitting for the northeastern section of our country and Massachusetts. But, now, a word for Pennsylvania and its historical Independence Hall.

First of all, when the hall was built, Benjamin Franklin has a very great interest in it, William Allen, Chief Justice of the Colony, provided the money for buying the land on which the building stands and Edmund Wooley staked out the ground and furnished the woodwork, and finally hung the Liberty Bell that proclaimed liberty throughout the land and to the inhabitants thereof. The building still stands; a national shrine, revered by all.

In this building met the Continental Congress after first having met in Carpenter's Hall nearby. Here George Washington was commissioned as Commander in Chief of the Army, here on the 14th day of June, 1777, the resolution was adopted creating the flag for the United States of America, here later the Second Continental Congress met, here Richard Henry Lee offered the resolution that the Colonies should be free and independent States, and here on the 2d day of July, 1776, was laid before the Congress the draft of the Declaration of Independence prepared by Thomas Jefferson in the house which has since been removed but the site of which will be marked by a plaque. The area leading down to the river is to be cleared creating a beautiful plaza.

Here again after the war was about to close and the Revolutionary Army was retiring to their homes, men marched upon the Congress and forced it to move elsewhere. Here again in the year 1787 met the great Constitutional Convention which was to give to the world the greatest document that ever fell from the

minds of man and which created our present form of government. Here again, when the Congress had reconvened and reassembled after moving from New York back to Philadelphia, the 10 amendments to the Constitution were recieved. Here the Articles of Confederation were first proposed.

So, all in all, this great site is not only the cradle of liberty, it is more than that, it is actually the symbol of everything that is good, true, and noble in these United States of America. That is our historical Pennsylvania and we ask your acceptance of this plan.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Is it not a fact that this project has been in progress for several years now?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is. And you are the author of the measure on which we are about to vote. You deserve great credit.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. And that it had been authorized by a previous Congress?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. It has now been determined that a little more money is needed to complete the project?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. And may I say that our beloved Speaker is entitled to a great deal of credit for what has been accomplished. He recognized the need for perpetuating this great shrine of liberty and gave us his help and assistance. We owe to him a lasting debt of gratitude.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Is it not a fact also that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has appropriated a considerable sum of money of its own?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. And left to the Federal Government the opportunity of taking and converting into a park that part which is so closely associated with the early formation of our Government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. It will restore a colonial site and give every boy and girl in America a glimpse of colonial America, such as now is exemplified and typified by the rejuvenation and restoration of Williamsburg. We will have the same thing in Philadelphia where everyone can see how those ancient patriots moved in the atmosphere and acted under conditions in which they lived at that time.

Future generations of Americans will be grateful for what we do here today.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], and pending that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as the reading reflects, is an open rule for the consideration of a bill which would, in effect, continue the present parity formula support prices on certain basic agricultural and other commodities for a period of 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this rule.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection on this side to the granting of the rule, and so far as I know, no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to very briefly point out to the Members from the agricultural sections, and particularly in the peanut field, the impending meeting which is to be held tomorrow by the PMA people, at which time permanent regulations will be promulgated for the administration of the peanut program during this year. Tentative regulations have been issued, and in those regulations are found some glaring inequities which should be corrected.

The Members who represent peanut areas are familiar with the problems with which we are faced and the inequities about which I speak. I am sure that it is the sentiment of all Members of the House from these areas that these inequities should be corrected tomorrow at the meeting. Notably among the inequities is the question of moisture content where, in the State of Georgia, for instance, the maximum moisture content is 9 percent, while in the State of Virginia it is 10 percent. There is no real reason why this discrimination should be made as between these two geographic areas.

Secondly, a change has been made in the matter of penalty for damaged kernels. Heretofore a 2 percent damage required a \$3.40 penalty, 4 percent would be \$6.80, and 5 percent \$10.20, but this year, under the proposed regulation, 5 percent damaged kernels would require \$20 a ton penalty, and 7 percent as high as \$55 a ton penalty. That is out of line and out of reason; there is no justification for this sort of regulation, and we feel that the PMA people tomorrow should bring those penalties back in line

with current regulations applicable during the past crop year.

Thirdly, we feel that the penalty for damaged kernels with reference to the support price should be raised back to 7 percent. Under the proposed regulations they have reduced their figure to 3 percent in order to qualify for a support price for peanuts. If you have more than 3 percent damaged kernels you do not qualify for the support price. We think that figure should be raised back to 7 percent.

These things are vital to the peanut growers. The growing of peanuts is no longer the profitable business it once was. Last year the peanut farmers suffered terribly by virtue of the regulations the PMA people had laid down for them. Many of our growers flatly said they would not produce peanuts for the market any longer, that what peanuts they planted would be fed to hogs, that they would not market them because of the unjust and unreasonable regulations. If they want to have adequate oil production and peanuts produced for edible purposes they should make fair regulations in order to get the required amount of production for this very vital and valuable commodity.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I concur heartily in what the gentleman has said, and express the sincere hope that the PMA people on tomorrow will do what the gentleman has suggested they do.

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to compliment the gentleman on his comprehensive and most laudable statement. As far as the 9-percent moisture rule relating to other States than Virginia is concerned, I have tried my dead level best to discover some reason for that rule, and I have been unable to find it. I believe the gentlemen from Virginia would join in the idea of our people that there is no reason on earth why there should be that discrimination.

The gentleman's argument about restoring the damaged peanut rule to 7 percent I believe is so fair and equitable that I sincerely hope the authorities will take cognizance of it and act accordingly.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. I concur in what the gentleman has said. It is my opinion that those rules constitute an unfair discrimination against the peanut farmers of the southeastern section. The gentleman will recall that we have been working with the PMA officials for the last 12 months in an effort to get them to change these regulations. I certainly hope that tomorrow the PMA officials will remove this discrimination against

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 705 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself

the peanut growers of the southeastern section.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. May I also thank the gentleman from Mississippi for allowing us this time to bring the matter before the House.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. Representing a peanut-growing area, I certainly concur in what the gentleman has said about regulations governing the 1952 crop. I hope the PMA will realize that it is in their hands as to whether or not the program the Congress has enacted will be successful. We can legislate a good program here, but if they want to carry out what the gentleman suggests they are going to carry out, they can destroy this program.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. Since the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, will explain the bill fully in the Committee of the Whole, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of continuing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8122, with Mr. DEMPSEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to continue the present support program for the basic agricultural commodities through 1955.

Section 1 of the bill is identical with the bill (S. 2115) recently reported with a favorable recommendation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This section of the bill would continue for two additional years—through 1955—the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which provides for a transitional period following the adoption of the modernized parity formula in which parity for the basic commodities is to be not less than the level under the formula in use prior to 1949.

When the modernized parity formula was adopted in the act of 1949, it was assumed that agriculture was entering a period of retrenchment when there would be a diminishing demand for

American agricultural exports, less necessity for production of cereals, and a general shift to grass farming and livestock products to meet the demands of American consumers. Accordingly, the modernized parity formula established in the act of 1949 was intended to encourage and assist the adjustment of American agriculture in this direction.

Unfortunately, the period of normal, peaceful world relationships and consumer demands contemplated at that time did not materialize. On the contrary, the Nation has found itself involved in the Korean war and a far-flung defense effort which has virtually put American agriculture again on a wartime footing, with unprecedented demands for cereals, cotton, and similar agricultural commodities.

Under these circumstances, extension for 2 years of the alternative parity provision of the 1949 act is in direct conformity with the principles of the act and is much more in keeping with the policies established therein than would be adherence to the existing letter of the law and termination of that provision at the end of 1953.

Section 2 of the bill will extend for the same period of time (through 1955) the present price-support program for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. It is the belief of the committee that the enactment of this provision is absolutely essential to assure the Nation adequate production of these important agricultural commodities during this emergency period.

All of these commodities are being supported at 90 percent of parity at the present time. It is probable that the Secretary of Agriculture would continue to support them at that level for the period prescribed by this bill. It is unlikely, therefore, that this bill will add anything whatever to the responsibility of the Government with respect to the support of these commodities.

On the other hand, it is certain that the bill will add tremendously to the response which may be expected from farmers to the Government's request for high-level agricultural production. Farmers have shown time and again since 1940 their willingness and their ability to meet unprecedented goals established by the Department of Agriculture. They know full well, however, that under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 they are acceding to the Government's request and meeting these high production goals at their own risk.

Production goals are established on the basis of the average out-turn which is expected per acre for the various crops. Good weather can boost that out-turn by as much as 20 or 25 percent, resulting in a crop even larger than that requested by the Department of Agriculture. A decrease in anticipated demand, either for exports, for stockpiling, or for domestic consumption can also occur. In either event, farmers who had patriotically undertaken to meet the Nation's production goals would find that they had created a situation in which their overabundant pro-

duction had destroyed their price at the market place and that price support would be reduced correspondingly at the very time when it was most needed.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the required level of price support for these basic commodities is determined by the carry-over which exists at the beginning of the marketing year. If this carry-over is larger than normal, the support level may be reduced in proportion to the size of the carry-over.

Obviously, the Government is going to have a much more certain assurance of the tremendous agricultural production it requests during these important years if farmers have the assurance that by acceding to the Department of Agriculture's high production goals they are not going to produce themselves out of a fair market price and at the same time produce themselves out of a fair support price.

Even more important, Mr. Chairman, than that is the fact that I do not believe the membership of the House believes in what we call the sliding scale of price support for agricultural commodities. This came about in 1949, and we were forced to accept it at that time, but the effective date was postponed. The effect of the pending legislation is to postpone it for two additional years. The effect of the sliding scale actually means that when the support is needed most, it is actually weakened. The support level goes down as supplies increase. That is exactly opposite to what we have been trying to do in providing this support for agricultural prices.

I would like also to say that originally it never was intended by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I do not think it was ever intended by the Congress, that we should support at high levels the prices of perishable and nonstorable agricultural commodities, which are the commodities among which we have sustained the greatest losses. On the support program for the basic agricultural commodities, cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, in the 18-year period that the program has operated, we have actually made a net profit to the Federal Government of \$35,000,000.

Many people are led to believe that this program has been burdensome to the taxpayer and burdensome to the consumer. That is not the fact. On the cotton program alone, we have made a profit of \$237,000,000. On the tobacco program we have made a substantial profit of several millions of dollars.

Even after taking into consideration the losses sustained on peanuts and some of the other basic commodities, we still have a profit in excess of \$35,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that in computing that profit on cotton and tobacco there is taken into consideration very large amounts of those items which have been purchased by the Government and shipped overseas under the foreign-

aid program at a figure which would yield such a profit?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The profit actually resulted from the increase in the price of cotton, which occurred between the time the Government became the owner and the time the Government actually disposed of it. I doubt if we will accumulate any profit on the cotton program in the future, because we have made certain changes, but the \$230,000,000 I mentioned actually went into the Treasury of the United States and it was a profit made on the cotton which had been taken over by the Government.

Mr. KEATING. But was not a large part of that through a transfer of funds from foreign aid to the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no. I do not think the foreign-aid program had anything at all to do with it. It may be that cotton has been exported to some of these recipient countries under the foreign-aid program, but so have other commodities and industrial goods. I do not think you can say the foreign-aid program had anything to do with this profit.

Mr. KEATING. How about tobacco?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. You have shipped great quantities of industrial articles also to all countries in the program.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but what I am asking the gentleman is whether in realizing the profit, the figures of which he has given to the House, it is not a fact that that profit, in large part, arises from the fact that tobacco has been turned over to the foreign-aid program at a high figure?

Mr. COOLEY. No, no. It has not been turned over at any high figure. They have acquired it in this market and they have sent it abroad at prevailing prices; certainly not at any give-away prices, that I am aware of.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the Mutual Security Act, and the Marshall plan act before it, provides that these products should not be turned over by the Commodity Credit Corporation except at the prices which it paid for them, or better, and therefore that is a written-in recoupment of any loss which it might have suffered, because it gets it out of these other appropriated funds?

Mr. COOLEY. It has not been in the law until now. We do have section 32 funds which have been used to accelerate exports of certain commodities, but certainly no particular commodity has imposed upon that fund. The section 32 money has been used for various and sundry purposes, as has been designated and fixed by the Congress.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. It may sound strange coming from a Member of the House representing a large urban consumer center to make the comment that I might want to make; that is, if the chairman of the committee or the Com-

mittee on Agriculture would have any objection to my offering an amendment striking out "90" on line 3, page 2, and inserting "100."

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's position. Frankly, I would probably be inclined to agree with the view he has expressed, but I know the committee does not feel that should be done at this time, and I doubt very much if the Congress would approve of that action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIER. I make that comment knowing what has happened to the farm income because of inflation and because of the ever-increasing cost of the things he buys. Even if parity had remained at 90 percent instead of the sliding scale, the farmer would be much worse off under the 90 percent than he was three or four years ago because of his added cost of production. So I want to make the same allowance to him in his parity price as we recognize is due to labor, 10 percent.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. What about the Farm Bureau and the Grange and the statement that some farm organizations were opposed to that? I was wondering if the gentleman could tell me if that is true.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct; notwithstanding the opposition, this great Committee on Agriculture composed of 30 men, Democrats and Republicans, being thoroughly familiar with all aspects of this bill, reported it by unanimous vote.

The farm leader that advocated the sliding scale and advocated weakening of the support program was just about advocating the wreckage of the entire program, because without this support I do not think we could have a successful program. In other words, I regard this as similar to the minimum wage and maximum hours for labor; it is a floor below which prices should not be permitted to go.

Notwithstanding the opposition of these men we still bring this bill to you for favorable action. Whenever a farm leader takes the position that has been taken by some with reference to this bill it is the same thing as a labor leader's coming here and saying they do not want minimum wages, maximum hours, the right to strike, or collective bargaining. I favor those things. But I do not think a labor leader would get very far even before the Committee on Education and Labor of this House on repealing those gains.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first brought up on the Consent Calendar I objected to it because I thought it ought not to be disposed of that way, and I would like to pay a special tribute to the chairman of

the committee and the ranking minority Member in not pressing the consent proposition, but being quite prepared to come here under a rule to have the bill discussed and open to amendment. I might say that that is also true of the majority and minority leaders, and I think it is a great tribute to the way we do business in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I approach this whole question with the greatest deference. I do not pretend to be an expert in this field. I say only that I think for too long we have gone along with the farm program without any scrutiny from the adversary point of view. The men on the Committee on Agriculture are good men; they are all friends of ours. They are essentially from agricultural districts, but they do not actually come up against the problems we have in the cities where people have to earn a living in which food represents a very large proportion of the city person's budget.

First let us get an idea as to the question of who is involved.

In the first place we are prone to think that we can make rapid adjustments, that if prices go up wages will rise, that the working people will try to get more in wages and that the whole economy will equalize itself out. As a matter of fact, that is not so, because a very large number of Americans are almost pure consumers, and I have figures that illustrate that.

There are 4,500,000 social security annuitants in the United States; there are 6,000,000 Government workers whose salaries adjust but very slowly to rapidly rising costs of living. I tried very hard to get an estimate as to the number who were living on incomes such as widows, orphans, and older people who have their own savings or annuities from life insurance companies, but it is almost impossible to obtain such information. It is a large figure in millions to say the least. Added to that would be 2,500,000 who receive benefits from veterans' pension and insurance legislation. Twenty-five million out of 61,000,000 actively employed in the United States who are so-called white collar workers, and we know that their salaries lag behind the more rapidly adjustable wages of the industrial workers most of whom are represented by unions.

I think there is one very good reason for not passing this bill. That is, it is unnecessary, right now to pass this bill. This statement I make advisedly for this reason:

The bill has two parts. First, it proposes to perpetuate the alternative of using the new modernized parity formula or the old 1910-1914 parity, whichever is higher—and I will explain in a few minutes why that is a serious matter—for 2 years beyond December 31, 1953. You do not have to do that now. There will be a new Congress here next year and there will be a full year in which to do it.

Second, fixing parity at 90 percent of the six basic commodities is also unnecessary now. We made that clear just last Saturday night when we passed the Defense Production Act which says that

if there shall be only 90 percent of parity and not less for the basic commodities for the full length of time the Defense Production Act is in effect, which is 10 months. So both things have been taken care of until such time as the new Congress returns, and there is no real urgency for this bill.

As to the merits of the proposition, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has pointed out that the farmers themselves in two great farm organizations, do not regard this as an unmixed blessing because two of the greatest of them, the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange, are against this very bill. I think that is of the greatest importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it would be important to insert at this point in the RECORD, as long as the gentleman has referred to the Farm Bureau, the fact that the president of that organization who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in opposition to this bill has made some very pertinent remarks about the Congress. In a recent speech made before the twentieth annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute at Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Allan B. Kline, president, stated:

What kind of representatives are they? Are they people with understanding? Some of these issues are just terribly simple, if they have a little bit of something to understand with. We have a lot of people in the Senate—oh, let's take the whole Congress. I want to spread this around a little bit. I do not want to quarrel with everybody. We have a lot of them down there that I have met personally and been cross-examined by very critically, where it was a very objective viewpoint. I am sure I can say honestly that they felt very happy after the cross-examination because they did not have sense enough to know how badly they had gotten beaten. When you have a lot of fellows like that, you know what happens.

Those are the words of the president of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that we in the House are so thin skinned we are going to let that convince us one way or the other. I intend to produce the reasons in connection with this bill. I have produced one so far, and that is the fact it is unnecessary now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman feel a guaranty of a minimum wage at this time is absolutely necessary?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to pay my respects to that argument.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman like to see that thrown out?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to answer the gentleman. I think a minimum wage in the United States by law is absolutely vital and necessary but is without relevancy to this issue.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman should admit they go hand in hand.

Mr. JAVITS. They do not go hand in hand.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Parity is simply a minimum wage for the farmer.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman asked a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will reiterate my question. Does the gentleman feel it would be proper to throw off all wage minimum guarantees?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to point out that the minimum-wage guarantee is not underwritten by the United States Government. The law says that he shall not be paid less by a private employer, but here on farm parity you are saying that this is an underwriting and every dollar of this guarantee of 90 percent of parity is going to be paid by the United States; if it is not paid by the consumer. That is a very different thing.

The Federal Government last year lost \$345,000,000 on this whole price-support program.

Mr. COOLEY. When the gentleman says "this program" that is not true.

Mr. JAVITS. I am going to elucidate on all the facts.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want the gentleman to leave the impression—

Mr. JAVITS. I am about, sir, to explain it, if I may. The Federal Government lost \$345,000,000 on the whole price-support program, including perishables. The Federal Government also has invested in the program right now something in the area of two and a quarter or two and a half billion dollars in commodities which are tied up in storage in one way or another. It has been said here that the Government has not lost much money on the price support for the six basic commodities. What has not been said is this, that in the case of wheat, the Government has paid, in other appropriations, not out of the Commodity Credit Corporation, about \$182,000,000 this year, which is, in practical effect, a subvention for exports under the international wheat agreement and which the farmer receives in another guise to the tune of say 60 cents a bushel of wheat because of the price-support situation.

I would like to get down to the fundamental point of why the provision in this bill proposes to prevent the single standard of modernized parity from obtaining, and why it is desired to have the alternative parities. The old standard is that the farmer could buy with the things that he sells the same standard of living he bought in the period from 1910 to 1914. This was found to be archaic. It was, admittedly, completely out of date, because it took no account of the relationship between the various farm commodities themselves, that is, increased efficiency of production, of which the public did not get the benefit, because it had not been reflected in the period of 1910 and 1914. So, the Committee on Agriculture adopted a new standard in the act of 1949 called the movable standard of parity, taking the average for 10 years, the immediately preceding 10 years.

Now we are asked not to let that new modernized parity standard go into effect until after 1955, a parity standard

which I think is much more fair to the consumer, which takes into consideration efficiency and new techniques. But we are asked to use whatever standard is higher, in effect, the old or the new. That results in putting the support price for wheat, for example, up something like 30 cents a bushel, and it also results in making a very material difference in the support price for peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, said that a worker would first have to get a job, as I understand, before he could avail himself of the minimum wage law.

Mr. JAVITS. I said more than that, not only would he have to get a job, but the minimum wage law did not guarantee payment by the Federal Government, which this law does.

Mr. GROSS. But a farmer has to produce a bushel of corn or raise hogs in order to collect the support price.

Mr. JAVITS. The farmer gets an underwriting from the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Not if he does not produce.

Mr. JAVITS. He gets the support price if he does produce, but the worker does not get any underwriting from the Federal Government as to collecting wages to yield him a certain standard of living or 90 percent or any other percent of it even if he works. I am not opposed to some floor under farm prices; I think the lessons of the depression taught that we have to have some way of doing that. I do feel that the changes which are sought to be made here are not appropriate with respect to the consumers' interests, that the sliding parity formula is an approach to greater fairness to the consumer, and that the modernized parity formula is an approach to greater fairness for the consumer. I therefore believe that the law ought to remain as it is. That is the basis for my opposition to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands that the farmers have lost 14 percent of net income since 1947; does he not?

Mr. JAVITS. I will take some time in the amendment stage to answer that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some comments on the remarks of the gentleman as to the necessity for this law. Before he started his speech he emphasized the fact that he was not an expert along these lines and then he proceeded to prove that he was not. He is not acquainted with the way the farmers operate, particularly the farmer who rents his land. He makes his plans this fall, and this is 1952. He makes his financing

arrangements this fall and in the early spring. Unless we have some guaranty that this 90 percent of parity will be observed during the year 1953 we find that he might not be able to make those arrangements.

We know that during the past several years, at least in my section, many of our farmers, due to adverse weather conditions and other circumstances, have actually lost money. They were in the hole at the beginning of this crop year. We had up until about a month ago a very fair prospect. I think they could have come out of it and made money this year and recouped some of the losses of former years, but if the drought we are experiencing now continues you are going to see literally thousands of farmers over the United States who are not only going to lose money this year but are going to be unable to obtain financing to continue farming next year. Without the production of those farmers many of you city people are going to find yourself in the position of being without food, in a sufficient supply.

I should like to mention briefly the fact that despite the fact that the head of the National Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Kline, has indicated that he does not favor this program, when we would pin him down in the committee he would have to admit that he did. At the same time, I want to say that Mr. Kline, as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, does not represent all the American farmers. He does not even represent some of the farm bureau federations of the several States. There have been in Washington during the past 2 weeks directors of the State farm bureaus of the various States who have stated to members of this committee that Allan Kline did not represent their views. Frankly, I do not know whom he does represent when he tries to tell you that the farmer is not entitled to 90 percent of parity. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota said here a minute ago. I think this should be 100 percent of parity. When the Government calls upon the farmers to produce and has them go to extraordinary expense in producing, they should be entitled to the same guaranties we offer to other segments of business. However, I do not think we should put that in this bill, because it would be defeated.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

(Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we see here today the eternal conflict between the consumer and the producer. I hope we can try for once today to see the other man's viewpoint. Surely we from agricultural America want to help the working men and women in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to have a floor under their wages. I have voted for that a good many times. I do not believe anybody should be asked to work for low wages. All we are doing here as far as agriculture is concerned is to give the very same protection to the farmer.

The gentleman from New York made the remark that the workingman first must have a job before he is entitled to any sort of wages. Certainly that is the case. At the same time, the farmer must also, in spite of tornadoes, windstorms, droughts, frosts, and what not, be able to produce a crop before he is able to take advantage at all of the 90-percent parity price support floor under the basic crops he produces.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, I want to lay these few facts before the House. We have had a total cost to the taxpayers over these 14 years of \$1,200,000,000 for the entire price-support program. We do not charge against the price-support program the \$2,043,000,000 which was used during World War II simply as a consumer subsidy to hold down the price of butter, milk, cheese, and meat. This subsidy helped the consumer but failed to make good to the farmer the loss he sustained through price ceilings set too low. The total cost to the taxpayers of America has been approximately \$1,200,000,000 to date. The more you think this over, the more you analyze it, the more you will realize, I believe, that it is one of the best investments that has ever been made by the taxpayers of America. Please remember that for every dollar of gross income given to agriculture, the whole Nation benefits by a purchasing power of \$6. In 1932 the gross farm income was only \$6,000,000,000. The gross income for the entire Nation that year as a result fell down to \$45,000,000,000, and our great Nation suffered the worst depression in its history. In 1947 the top income year for agriculture saw about \$33,000,000,000 go to the farmers of the Nation, in return for the food we produced. Now mark this, the gross income of the entire Nation equaled almost exactly seven times that amount or slightly over \$233,000,000,000.

Depress farm income and immediately the unemployment rolls in the Nation swell. Give to agriculture a fair share and a fair price, parity, for its products, and the entire Nation will prosper along with agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the industrial East does not accept this proven theory and put its own people to work by building upon the only new source of wealth, that produced out of the earth in agriculture, forestry, and mining.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my neighbor on the west.

Mr. LOVRE. Is it not true that this bill also assists the consumer because it provides an incentive to the farmers to produce more, and when you produce more, you have ample food which allows the law of supply and demand to operate so that the consumer will receive his food at an even cheaper price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I would feel mighty sorry for the constituents of my good friend of New York City [Mr. JAVITS] unless there was some incentive for the farmers out my way to produce

food to keep his people from going hungry. They would starve to death if it were not for the great bread basket of the United States, that area 500 miles contiguous to Chicago. I would certainly feel sorry, Mr. JAVITS, for your consumers if it were not for the great amount of food that we produce throughout the Midwest, and I do not see how any reasonable man, and any man of your caliber and your thinking ability, can argue against the principle of parity for agriculture. Destroy through low, unprofitable prices to the hardest working segment of our population, the farmers of our Nation, the incentive to produce and perhaps we might again see, as we saw back in 1943, right in this city, people beginning to form bread lines hoping that they can buy some meat or butter or some bread in the stores that they had dealings with. Surely we do not want those times to return.

Mr. LOVRE. There is no better friend of the farmer than the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOVRE. Not only has he worked hard for the farmers, here in the Congress, but also for the REA and other related matters relating to farm operations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is very fine of the gentleman to say that.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope this bill will pass unanimously. After all, it is just this spurt put into the blood stream of our economy which will insure that we will have ample food at a reasonable price for all of the children in America. The farmers do not want high prices. However, we must have equality with other groups if we are to produce ample food. I repeat, I sincerely hope this bill will pass. It is little enough in the form of protection to the basic industry in America—agriculture.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who has always supported strongly the principle of parity during the 14 years we have served here together.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks, and I am pleased to say as much and more for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] about his constant support of all legislation for the benefit of the farmers of our Nation, which, in the final analysis, benefits every American, hence I am glad to go on record in support of this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending bill which extends

the present support prices on the basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity for 2 years.

The farmer, by reason of the hazards of his business, is unable to produce for the market with any certainty as does industry. In order to secure production and to prevent their bankruptcy there must be some assurance of price. The cities have as great an interest in this production as any other segment of our society because if the farmer goes out of business the cities will not be fed.

The mechanism by which the support price is maintained is the Commodity Credit Corporation. This Corporation's Federal charter was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, and it is under the jurisdiction of that committee. As chairman of the committee it has always been my purpose to strengthen this Corporation and to be assured that its powers and authority are broad enough to permit it to perform its functions to the fullest extent. It has performed a great service to all our citizens by causing production to be increased and stabilizing the prices of agricultural products. In the carrying out of this essential function it has been very successful. Since its inception on October 17, 1933, through April 30, 1952, support-price operations on the six basic agricultural commodities have resulted in a profit of \$32,000,000. Cotton and tobacco have yielded its greatest profits.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

(Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

A PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation—H. R. 8122—to continue price supports at 90 percent parity on the six basic farm crops—wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. This measure to guarantee an approximate cost-of-production to millions of American farmers should be enacted into law, and I intend to cast my vote for its passage.

By endorsing this bill, I do not mean to suggest that it is the last word in farm legislation, nor do I consider it the final solution to the problem of achieving permanent prosperity for the 27,000,000 Americans who till our Nation's 6,000,000 farms. In other words, this bill is only one step toward farm prosperity, but it is certainly not the last step to be taken.

FULL PARITY NEEDED ON ALL FARM CROPS

In my opinion, this price-support bill is subject to two major weaknesses. First, it merely provides for price supports at 90 percent of parity instead of guaranteeing full 100 percent parity. I realize that parity at 90 percent is better than the 60-90 percent sliding-scale formula set forth in the GOP support program adopted during the Eightieth Congress. However, it is still not good enough, and it is my hope that Congress will soon accept the 100 percent parity principle as a basic principle of permanent farm legislation.

A second weakness in this bill is that it applies only to nonperishable farm

crops—to the so-called basic crops—and does nothing to stabilize prices on such perishable commodities as vegetables, eggs, potatoes, milk, butter, and other dairy products. It is my firm conviction that Congress should extend the parity principle to all farm products—perishable and nonperishable—and that perishable crops should be supported at 100 percent parity through the medium of production payments as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan back in 1948. Full parity on all farm crops offers the solution to the problem of guaranteeing cost of production to the farmers of this country.

A BETTER FARM PROGRAM NEEDED

This country has made great strides toward developing a sound and practical farm program during the last 20 years. This program—which was built plank by plank by the late President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party—rests on such basic legislation as the triple-A, the Soil Conservation Act, the Farm Credit Act, and the rural electrification law. Because of this enlightened and forward-looking legislation, we can point with pride to two decades of steady progress toward farm security and higher living standards in rural America.

Let us examine the record. In 1932 some 42 percent of our farms were run by tenants and most of the other 58 percent were mortgaged to the hilt. Today 75 percent of the farmers own their own land, possessing an average equity of 91 percent. In 1932 only 10 percent of our farms had electricity—today—largely due to REA—over 90 percent of our farms have electric power. In 1932 the cash value of total farm production was \$5,000,000,000 per year—today farm income is running at \$32,000,000,000. American farms are producing 50 percent more food today than they were 20 years ago, and average real income has tripled during the same period.

Regardless of this progress, we cannot afford to stop and rest on our laurels—the economic facts of life require that we press on to new levels of farm production. According to population experts, there will be 38,000,000 more Americans 25 years from now, which means that for every four persons sitting down to a meal today, there will be a fifth person at the table in 1975. This means that we must increase farm production by 25 percent in the next quarter century just to maintain our present level of diet.

Increased farm production, higher rural living standards, and greater farm security are the policy goals which the Federal Government must seek, and it is my contention that these goals can be realized by the extension and improvement of the Roosevelt farm program. We have the basic legislation already on the statute books—we should now broaden and liberalize such basic legislation in the interests of farm prosperity and national welfare.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will use the remaining minutes of my allotted time to discuss those broad objectives of agricultural policy which I consider of major importance, and to

make some positive recommendations for achieving these objectives. It seems to me that the attention of Congress should be given to the following seven proposals:

Stabilize farm income at full parity: The stabilization of farm income at a level reflecting the cost of production and improved living standards is of prime importance to every farmer, and a goal which I heartily endorse. As I have already indicated, the principle of price supports—as embodied in this bill (H. R. 8122) now under consideration—is the soundest method for stabilizing farm income. I do maintain, however, that we should support farm prices at full parity instead of 90 percent, and that all farm products, both perishable and nonperishable, should be supported under the price-support program. The dairy farmer, the truck farmer, and the poultry farmer have as great a need for full parity as does the grower of corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco—we should give all farmers the benefit of a sound and workable support program.

Expand soil-conservation program: This country has—through the Soil Conservation Act of 1936—made some very real progress in conserving the productivity of the Nation's soil. However, it is a well-established fact that the natural productivity of most of our soils is still going down faster than it is being restored and improved. For this reason, it is mandatory that our soil-conservation efforts be intensified. More attention should be given to flood control and reforestation to stop soil erosion, more adequate funds are needed for conservation research and education, and we should experiment with direct payments to farmers for soil-conservation practices.

Increase REA power: The REA program has proven itself remarkably successful—its record of accomplishment is a tribute to the cooperative efforts of the Nation's farmers working through their REA cooperatives and the Federal Government. About 9 out of 10 farms today have electric power—and rural electrification can be 100 percent in a few years if we continue our efforts. Congress should continue to provide adequate appropriations for REA, and we need to make greater efforts to develop more electric power and build more REA transmission lines so that our farmers can realize the full benefits of this vital program of electrification.

Secure family size farm: Experience shows that the family owned and operated farm is the most efficient method of farm production and the greatest strength of community life. Family ownership means greater independence and security for our farm population, and it also means that the farm income is spent at home instead of being drained off from the community as it is where we have corporate absentee farming.

It is encouraging to note that the trend is toward individual farm ownership and operation—today nearly three-quarters of all farmers own their own land. This marks a reversal of the trend prior to 1933 which was toward increased farm tenancy (in 1932, 42 percent of the country's farms were run by tenants).

I think it is clear that this change away from farm tenancy and in favor of the family size farm is due to the farm credit policies of the Federal Government. Since our farm-credit policies have proved themselves by such great value, I think we should expand this credit program to give easily available credit at low interest rates to finance farm purchases, and give special emphasis to the loan operations of the Farm Home Administration to help low-income farmers.

More funds for research: There is a crying need for more adequate funds for continued research in all fields of scientific agriculture. We should, for example, provide more liberal appropriations for the Bureau of Animal Industry which is working on control of animal disease. The past record of this Bureau shows that it is capable of doing an outstanding job in providing technical know-how and leadership in controlling animal diseases. We should, by all means, furnish more funds to this agency for controlling Bang's disease and the hoof-and-mouth disease. Funds for improved methods of agriculture is always a good investment, and in the future we should be less economy-minded on this budget item than we have in the past.

Forestry for off-farm employment: Many farmers in my area of northern Minnesota earn part of their livelihood from the forest industries—from logging and pulpwood operations. It occurs to me that any farm program must therefore include measures to provide greater opportunity for off-farm employment. The extension of the forest practices program, with emphasis upon wood-lot forestry, tree planting, and technical forest assistance to farmers, would be a real boon to rural people, both in Minnesota and many other States.

Farmer participation in program administration: I am convinced that one of the reasons why such farm programs as Production and Marketing Administration, REA, and crop insurance, have operated so successfully is the farmers committee system. The farmers committee system is a democratic system—it is squarely in line with the American principle of self-help. I am amazed to find that some people have criticized this form of farmer participation, but regardless of what some may say, the farmer committees have done an outstanding job in formulating and helping administer our farm programs. The committee system must be continued and adequate funds must be appropriated to enable them to operate properly.

Another form of farmer activity which deserves our continued support is the work of farm cooperatives. These cooperative organizations have given the farmer lasting benefits in both the marketing of farm products, the purchase of machinery, and in rural electrification. They deserve every encouragement, and I have nothing but contempt for the NTEA crowd who would use the Federal taxing power to destroy the cooperative movement.

Mr. Chairman, the policy recommendations which I have just outlined con-

stitute a framework for a basic program for the American farmer. Such a program would stabilize farm income at full parity, maintain farm production at high levels, preserve soil fertility, and create the conditions under which the family-size farm would thrive and prosper. I maintain that such a program would guarantee continued progress toward the desired goals of farm prosperity and rural welfare.

The American farmer has the know-how and the will to supply the Nation's food needs. They have been meeting the food demands in both peace and war, and I know they will continue to do so. For this they deserve our consideration—they deserve a public opinion climate in which agriculture is allowed to improve and expand so that the farmer himself will receive the fruits of his labor. In this connection, I quote from a speech made on the House floor on April 30 last by our colleague and my very good friend, the Congressman from Minnesota's Sixth District [Mr. MARSHALL], when he said:

So far as farmers are concerned, filling stomachs is not an end in itself, unless it also brings mental and spiritual rewards such as a slackening in the terrific pace of farm work, increasing chances for rest and recreation for the whole family, and investing earnings in education, health, and home conveniences.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who has spoken on behalf of the consumers of his district and of the country. Certainly, no one would want to say for a moment that their interests should not be very carefully guarded in connection with any legislation of this kind. However, I think any study of the farm legislation that has been enacted in this country during the past 15 years would show that the interest of the consumer has been kept in mind. I know of no better proof of that, than the fact that during that period of time the per capita consumption of agricultural commodities in this country has increased by 13 percent. If it were true that farm programs were putting the price of farm commodities beyond the reach of consumers, that, of course, would not have occurred.

Furthermore, I want to point out that in addition to the increased quantity consumed there has been a change in the character of that consumption, in that the consumption of dairy products, meat, poultry, eggs, and fresh vegetables has increased tremendously, while there has been a decrease in the consumption of the cheaper starchy foods like potatoes and cereals. Not only has the quantity consumed increased, but that increase has been in the higher-priced commodities. That all negates the implication that is carried in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that the farm program is preventing the people of this country from enjoying proper quantities and kinds of food because they cannot afford to buy it.

Let me point out also that the statistics show that the people today are

spending about the same percentage of their income for food that they were spending 10 or 15 or even 5 years ago, with this difference: That they are today getting more and better food than they were getting at that time. If they were consuming the same kind and quantity of food now that they were consuming 10 or 15 years ago they would be paying a smaller percentage of their income for food now than they were at that time. To further supplement those points I want to call attention to some of the figures in a table which I hold in my hand showing what 1 hour's industrial pay would purchase in terms of certain articles of food now and at various times in the past. First, I want to mention bread.

Back in 1914 an hour's industrial pay would purchase 4 pounds of bread; in 1951 it would purchase 10 pounds; in 1939 when all prices were certainly low, an hour's industrial pay would purchase only 7.9 pounds of bread.

Pork chops: In 1914 an hour's industrial labor would purchase 1 pound of pork chops; in 1929 it would purchase 1.5 pounds; in 1949, 1.9 pounds, while in 1951 it would purchase 2 pounds.

Butter: Back in 1914 an hour's industrial pay would purchase 0.6 pounds of butter. In 1929 it would purchase 1 pound. In 1939 it would purchase 1.9 pounds, and in 1951 it would purchase the same quantity, 1.9 pounds.

Take oranges: Back in 1919 an hour's industrial labor would purchase 0.9 pounds of oranges; in February 1951 it would purchase 3.2 pounds; in 1939, 3.2 pounds; and so I might read on from the list of all of the usual articles that one buys in a grocery store including steak, eggs, milk, potatoes, and many others. In practically every case these figures show that 1 hour's industrial labor will purchase far more food now than at any period in the past 40 years.

What we are attempting to do in this bill is not to increase support prices, not to go any further than we have gone, but simply to make it mandatory to continue for 3 years the present level of supports on the basic commodities. The bill would also continue the use of the dual-parity provision until December 31, 1955 on the basic commodities; in other words, if we pass this legislation we continue the program that is now in existence, a program which has certainly not resulted in higher prices for food to the consumers of this country.

As far as basic commodities are concerned we are in the situation now where it is important to continue production at least on the present level. A few years ago it might not have been anticipated that this would be the case. At that time we were concerned about surpluses, and the farm program to a considerable extent was a program for the prevention and disposal of surpluses. In the meantime, however, the situation has changed and our problem in the future is more likely to be one of producing enough to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population than it will be to reduce or curtail production. That means that we need support prices as an incentive to secure production of sufficient quanti-

ties of agricultural products; and that, in the main, is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas the most expensive part of the normal family's diet being meat, if it is not true that the two most important meat products, beef and pork, are actually selling for less on the farm today than they were 4 years ago, and at the same time are costing the consumer at the butcher shop more per pound?

Mr. HOPE. I am sure that is a correct statement of the situation. I agree with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HARVEY. I simply offer that because I very frequently hear the statement made that the increased cost of living, particularly with regard to meat which is essential to our diet, is attributable to the increased cost at the farm. I think it is only fair to show by this statement that the increased cost of meat is not attributable to increased costs as they leave the farm.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman for making that point clear. It is an important point and should appear in this discussion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I remember that in one of our appropriation bills there was a provision made for investigation by the Department of Agriculture of the difference in cost as between production by the farmer and when purchased by the consumer. Has the Committee on Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture published any report yet on that point?

Mr. HOPE. I am not aware of any report having been published as yet in compliance with that request; however, the Department of Agriculture issues publications regularly which show the relationship between farm prices and food prices. In other words, they show the margin between the prices that the farmer gets and the prices the consumer pays. Some information is available in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this so-called modernized double-barreled parity approach which provides a legislative guaranty of continued higher prices to American consumers. Furthermore, I am at a loss to understand why such an important measure certain to have an effect on living costs in every American home should be brought before us today without printed hearings being available to the membership.

I have heard it said here today that the bill will do a real job for the peanut belt and other belts in our country. Belts is indeed a proper word and Ameri-

can consumers are on the receiving line. Even the two largest farm organizations in the country, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange are bitterly opposed and, speaking for the latter organization, J. T. Sanders has declared the proposed steps would be hard to "justify before the American bar of public opinion."

Commenting on the meaning of this new deal for agriculture, which is being protested by so many farmers as inherently wrong and indefensible, the New York Times says editorially:

Under the present law a new parity formula is supposed to go into effect for all base crops at the beginning of 1954. The present is a transition period, and in that period producers of a given crop may use either the old or the modernized parity. The Senate Committee on Agriculture recently passed a bill which would postpone the effective date for the introduction of the new formula until at least 1956. And this week the House Committee on Agriculture has given the present law both barrels, as it were. In addition to eliminating the provision affecting the change-over to the new parity (which yields lower prices in most cases than the old) it has proposed abandonment of the so-called flexible price support provisions of the present law. It would make it mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices rigidly at 90 percent of parity.

Here is a proposal for subsidizing agriculture so obnoxious that the Nation's two great farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, have vigorously opposed it as public policy. They have done so because they have the courage and the breadth of view to consider it in terms of the interests of the Nation as a whole. And the administration? How does the administration feel about the national interest on this issue? All we know on that point is that Secretary Brannan, appearing to testify on the legislation, has given it his official blessing.

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, this bill has for its purpose the continuation of the present support program for the basic agricultural commodities through 1955 and extending for the same period of time the present price-support program for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

I think that we all agree that we want a sound and prosperous agriculture. It is our basic wealth; and when we have a sound agricultural economy, there is no doubt but that it will be reflected Nation-wide and all groups will benefit. Let us look at the cost. The price-support program has cost the Federal Government over a period of 18 years about a billion dollars. Potatoes and eggs were largely responsible for this loss; in fact, potatoes for about one-half. Perishable commodities have produced most of the loss. Cotton has been a money-making proposition for the Government. We are about \$35,000,000 ahead over this period of time on the basic crops.

So it is with the basic commodities that we are concerned with in this legislation.

It is not all rosy even with 100-percent support. A few minutes ago you heard a discussion of the rules and regulations that PMA will issue tomorrow with regard to peanuts. Even when we have this 90-percent support we have very little to do with the administration of the law. PMA can set up regulations as to moisture content of peanuts and many other regulations which serve to reduce the 90 percent. I do hope that the contemplated drastic regulations will be modified.

This legislation will insure to our Nation abundant production and, at the same time, fair and reasonable prices for the consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this bill and I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for bringing it up.

If there ever was a time for supporting farm produce at 90 percent of parity and continuing the dual parity formula, it is now. If there are any deficiencies in this bill, they are that it does not support all farm produce at 90 percent of parity. Mr. Chairman, it is to be remembered that this bill supports only the six basic commodities—corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton, and peanuts.

Parity, as you know, Mr. Chairman, is a price that has been determined to be fair to both consumer and producer. This being true, it seems to me that the producer is entitled to 100 percent of parity and not 90 percent or 75 percent or anything less than 100 percent.

We must have food and at prices that we can afford to pay. This bill will do just that, because it provides an incentive to produce and only by producing in ample quantities can we have food at reasonable prices. Thus, Mr. Chairman, it can be seen that this bill is a protection not only for the producer but the consumer as well.

Remember that our farmers are the only ones who do not put a price tag on their commodities. They haul their produce to market and must either accept the price that is offered or haul the produce back home. For this reason, too, the farmers need the protection of this bill.

The farmer has learned from bitter experience that he can produce himself into bankruptcy. He remembers the thirties and he is not going to let that happen again if he can help it.

Mr. Chairman, our farmers are ready and willing to step up production of food that is so badly needed and which has been requested of them by our National Defense Department. But they want assurances that they will get a fair price. They are entitled to that assurance, particularly at a time like this when their operating costs are rising daily and at a time when net farm income is lower than it was in 1947 and in 1948. Not only is net farm income lower today than it was in 1947 and 1948 but our farmers today receive less of the national income than at any time since 1947. In 1947 the farm percentage of

total national income was 8.6 percent; in 1948 it was 7 percent; in 1949 it was 6.2 percent; in 1950 it was 5.3 percent; and in 1951 it was 5.4 percent. This condition cannot be permitted to continue. If it does it will mean the end to our great agricultural industry.

Mr. Chairman, so long as farm income is up, we will have busy factories. History shows that for every dollar of farm income we have \$7 of national income. When farm income goes up, national income goes up seven times. When farm income goes down, the national income goes down seven times.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest not only of the producer but also the consumer and in the interest of our national economy, it is imperative that we assure our farmers of not less than 90 percent support price for their produce. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this House will pass this bill now before us.

Mr. Chairman the time will come when we will have to adopt a long range farm program that will assure our farmer of 100 percent parity for all farm products on a self-supporting and self-governing basis. I have introduced such legislation which I sincerely hope will be passed by the Congress within the near future.

(Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], which attempts to take peanuts out of the bill. This amendment does not do what is intended, to wit: Remove peanuts as one of the basic commodities. What it does do is to keep peanuts from being on equal footing with the other basic commodities so far as this bill is concerned.

The peanut program has received considerable unjustified criticism in recent months. During the emergency the Government called on peanut farmers to greatly expand the production of peanuts. The farmers answered the call. When that emergency was over, it became necessary to have a gradual reduction in peanut acreage so as not to wreck the economy of the peanut producers. I realize that the peanut program has cost some money, but the producers, themselves, together with their Representatives in the Congress for the past several years, have been working together in an endeavor to put the peanut program on a sustained basis and I believe that the legislation enacted in the past 18 months or 2 years has gone a long way toward solving our problem.

I call on the Members of this House to vote down the amendment and let us work this problem out in an orderly fashion which I believe, as a matter of fact, has been done to a large extent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this legislation but I will support it because it is too late in this session of Congress to obtain real justice for the farmers of America.

I am opposed to 90 or even 100 percent of so-called parity. I have demanded for years and will continue to demand no less than cost-of-production prices for the farmers of this Nation.

Anything less than cost of production for farmers is to deny them equal treatment with industry.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I support this bill only because I cannot support a better program. The time is long past due when Congress should strike down this deception known as parity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say with reference to the remarks by the gentleman from New York in regard to the background and interest of the Committee on Agriculture, that while I realize it is the fact that all members of that committee are interested necessarily in the welfare of agriculture, I do not think they are unduly interested in it, and it certainly seems to me that if this program was not sound basically, somebody on the committee would have objected to it. I am sure the gentleman from New York knows that the House Committee on Banking and Currency brought in, in the Defense Production Act, a continuation of the 90-percent program for the life of that act. Now if the Committee on Agriculture is unduly interested in agriculture, it is difficult to reconcile that with the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency also realizes the importance of this provision. When you speak of the gains, the progressive legislation enacted in behalf of labor, the fact remains that labor does have certain protection that none of us would want to take away from them. They have unemployment compensation, social security, minimum wages, and maximum hours and other rights that they exercise. Unfortunately the farmers of this Nation cannot exercise the same rights that have been given to labor. When an industrial worker works 8 hours, he can quit. When a farmer plants a crop in the field he must follow it all the way to harvest. He cannot turn a switch, he cannot taper off, he cannot strike, and he cannot shut down; he has got to go on. This is a basic right, and it seems to me we should be glad to accord to agriculture that right—that is, a floor below which he will not fall in the event we have tremendous surpluses that accumulate in response to Government requests for higher production.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any

date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 1, strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment that this deferment of the use of the modernized parity standard should be eliminated from the bill; in other words, that at the end of next year we should have the single, modernized parity standard on which to compute parity.

Mr. Chairman, something has been made here of the fact that neither the Farm Bureau Federation or, at least, Mr. Alan Kline, who spoke for it, its president, or the National Grange, ought to be considered too seriously in connection with this question.

Let me point out that Mr. Kline, the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, said that his Federation represents 1,452,210 farm families, which sounds like a very big outfit to me, because that is about 25 percent of the farm families in the United States. He was not speaking for himself because he said at the outset, "I want to make it clear that this bill violates fundamental policy principles of the American Farm Bureau Federation." He then cited a resolution adopted at their last annual meeting, from which I read the following sentence:

We do not believe that action to raise the level of price support above that now provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 is in the long-run the interest of farm people.

Now let me read what the master of the National Grange said in his testimony, and again I quote:

In the second place, this provision of a dual parity formula is bad in that it is detrimental to a further improvement and refinement to a satisfactory unified parity formula.

I would like the Members to listen to this quotation, and again I quote:

If we do not strive for such a formula we shall decidedly weaken our case before the 80 percent of our people who are nonagricultural.

Let me give you the figures which bear that out, and represent what I think is a real peril to the farmer in this effort to push the whole parity guaranty beyond what it ought to be in reason and fairness to the consumer.

In 1939 the Consumers' Price Index showed all prices, all items in the cost of living at 99.4, and at the same time food in the cost of living index was 95.2; in other words, they were just about even. When you get down to May 15, 1952, the latest figures, what do you find? You find that all items in the Consumers' Price Index have gone up to 189 but food has gone up to 230.8. I submit that with food having outstripped all other items by such a material amount we are certainly justified in taking another look at this whole farm parity program.

What does this dual parity standard which is sought to be continued do? Take wheat, for example. Under the old parity, 1910 to 1914, which I do not think can be justified under today's conditions, it fixes a support floor under that, based on a parity of 30 cents a bushel more than under modernized parity, and I repeat, this is a support floor. No little business gets paid on the basis of a support floor, nor does any worker, no matter what has been said about that. Here the Government underwrites the price. I say I am for it. It is necessary for farmers in view of the depression experience, put on a reasonable basis, but I say that trying to push it further than it is in the law today is an unreasonable basis.

The old parity for wheat is \$2.42 a bushel. The modernized parity for wheat is \$2.10. Why should not the consumers of the United States have that lower floor under prices rather than the higher floor under prices when it is the latter, lower figure, which is modernized parity, instead of the old 1910-1914 parity?

In peanuts—that makes two of these six basic commodities—it is 13.1 cents a pound for peanuts under the 1910-1914 parity and 10.7 cents a pound, a very material difference there of well over 25 percent—under the modernized parity.

It seems to me the very least we ought to do in this situation in view of the opposition of two of the great farm organizations, in view of the fact that consumer prices for food have far outstripped the rise in general consumer's price index for all items and in view of the fact that modernized parity adopted by this great Committee on Agriculture itself represents the modern conception of what the farmer's basic price guarantee ought to be figured on—I think the least we can do in fairness to the consumer is to strike out what has been properly called this double-barrel as far as the consumer is concerned, giving both the old parity and the new parity, and the right to take the highest of either. I just do not think that makes any case, and apparently it did not to the two big farm organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 21, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 101 (d) thereof:

"(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio: On page 2, line 5, after the word "commodity" insert the words "excepting peanuts."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, frankly, from the fate of the previous amendment, I do not expect I have much of a chance of getting this amendment adopted, with only about 100 members on the floor. I do think a very good case can be made for the exception of peanuts.

I do not know whether you realize or not, but in this bill peanuts are defined as a basic commodity, basic to the agriculture of this Nation. I happen to represent a district that does not grow any peanuts, but does produce a lot of milk and butter and meat, and I do not see anywhere in the basic farm legislation that either of those commodities is called basic. Oh, I know the argument will be made that they are perishable, but there is a great deal of question in my mind as to whether or not peanuts can be stored. I will say this—that the Government has not treated peanuts as a storable product in the past. They have treated them as a perishable commodity, and have sold them for crushing immediately when they bought them, and have in effect subsidized peanut growers.

In 1950, there were 2,277,000 acres of peanuts grown in this country as against 83,302,000 acres of corn. Yet the peanut program costs the taxpayers considerably more than the corn program, which had an acreage nearly 40 times as large. The peanut program has cost the taxpayers or did cost the taxpayers in the year 1950, \$7.04 an acre for every acre of peanuts grown. Next highest in cost was wheat, and in that year, it was less than one-third as much as peanuts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. From 1937 to 1950, the peanut price support has averaged about \$2 an acre as compared to tobacco at only 50 cents and wheat only 25 cents.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the gentleman's amendment should be accepted.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to thank the gentleman. I want to say further in the years 1933 through 1951, the Government made money on two basic commodities in this act—tobacco and cotton. It lost money on the other four commodities, namely, peanuts, wheat, corn, and rice. But with corn and wheat together having 80 times the acreage of peanuts, still the loss on peanuts was \$84,000,000 against a \$70,000,000 loss on wheat. In other words, we have picked up and written into the basic-commodity law here, or are attempting to write into the law, a commodity, which in my opinion, is in no way basic. As a matter of fact, I think you might as well write in that radishes are a basic commodity. I do not know how the acreage compares, but I think there must be nearly as many acres in radishes as there are of peanuts, and certainly radishes are a basic food item.

I want you to know I am for a parity program. I believe in order to have a sound economy, the farmers must have some assurance that they can plan

ahead and that they will have some kind of guaranty when their crops mature as to the kind of price that they are going to get. I believe this country cannot be prosperous without a sound agricultural economy.

I say to you when we stick into the law language that makes such items as peanuts basic commodities, I do not know exactly where we may stop. I do not want to bore this Committee with a lot of figures, but I have the figures for all commodities, and I want to reiterate that with all the tremendous acreages of the other basic commodities, peanuts has been the thing that has cost the taxpayers of this country the most money.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Can the gentleman tell us what the Government paid as a subsidy for peanuts in the last year or 2 years ago?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Right at this time I have only the year 1950. It cost the Government \$16,625,930 for peanuts. That was the biggest cost to the Government of anything except wheat, but wheat had 61,000,000 acres as against 2,000,000 acres for peanuts, and the cost was very little different.

As I said a moment ago, from 1933 through 1951 peanuts cost the taxpayers of this country \$84,000,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And that was paid for by the taxpayers all over the United States.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Paid for by the taxpayers all over the United States. If my amendment is adopted this cost will be saved to the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think what I was hopeful of before has happened. Those who are supporting this bill are being required to put forward all their arguments. It is very obvious what will happen to those affected. The consumer in the cities and the farmer on the farm will both be doing some thinking about the fundamental thesis which is being expressed here.

A very dangerous argument, in my view, is the argument that the 90 percent of parity support is going to be an incentive to production. I say, with all deference to my friends who represent the rural areas, that is a two-pronged argument, as far as they are concerned. I can see the fight on this in terms of a basic guaranteed floor to the farmer to prevent price collapse, but when one talks about a production incentive, just begin to think about the storm which was created here when the gentleman who is now Secretary of Agriculture brought out a plan which bears his name which was interred, as I remember it, in short order with loud howls. Yet any idea of stimulating production by giving some kind of a guaranty of production payment is strangely reminiscent of that situation.

Let me show you what has happened to the farmer, which I think is very important, because he is still a basic consumer in this country. I am not unmindful of the fact that we eat what he raises and he wears what we make. The farmer of 1951 is having the largest gross receipts which he has had in all the postwar years, \$37,404,000,000, but what does he have left? Fourteen billion nine hundred and twenty-nine million dollars, over two billion dollars less than he had in 1947, which was about his best net income years. In other words, the inflationary spiral which is created by increasing food prices, which for the short range looks fine, when you are getting large supports, begins to militate against the farmer when the prices on the things he buys go up as well.

The last point is this, and I think this is what is worrying many of the people in the cities: We are dealing with a lot of farmers to whom this 90 percent of parity support is important and basic, but we are dealing also with some big-scale operators to whom this 90 percent means simply the basis for a windfall of money beyond the proper operations of their abilities and of the market. I think that very clearly explains the worry a lot of people are having, especially those who are consuming these products in the cities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any comparable industry to agriculture that has lost 14 percent in the last few years?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the consumer has been suffering even more.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman has stated the figures of what the farmer made and what he had left. I am sure the gentleman realizes that what they do have left is worth just half as much as what they had before?

Mr. JAVITS. That is true. I am only pointing out that this situation is catching up with all of us, including the very farm people we are talking about here today.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is really questionable as to whether any comment should be made on this amendment. I think the House long ago recognized peanuts as a basic commodity. This is a sort of perennial attack which is made; it is not new; we have settled it on other occasions, and I am sure today the House will continue to recognize peanuts as a basic commodity, but I think it would be significant to mention today that the acreage of peanuts throughout the country has been brought down, and down, and down, to conform more nearly to the basic requirements for peanuts.

Peanuts have played a very important part in our defense program in the past, and even now there is a great demand

for an adequate amount of oil. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked for the production of a certain amount of peanuts. That acreage will be held to a realistic figure. There is no need for apprehension about the costliness of this program. I think the experiences we have had in the past have taught both the farmers and the Department of Agriculture how to handle this program in such manner as to avoid excessive cost to the taxpayer or to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe that the Members of the House will recognize the necessity for carrying on this program in these times, and it is our hope that you will vote down this amendment as you did the preceding one.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ABBITT. Is it not true that recently the peanut program has been put on a very sound basis, and that the whole program has been brought into line and that we both this year and in the last few years have been coming back down to earth after these requests on the part of the Government to increase peanut production greatly? It has taken some years to get back to normal, but we have gotten there.

Mr. PRESTON. Absolutely; and the farmers themselves have voted a reduction in this program. They realize as well as anyone that when abuses occur, that when excess production occurs the cost is unreasonable it is damaging to the entire support program of the country. We did not want excessive planting of peanuts or any other commodity, but we did think we should produce the amount required for the national-defense program.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman has made an outstanding statement, and certainly a logical statement. I wonder if some of the opposition realizes that down in the section that I come from that a few years ago we suffered greatly from the boll weevil and that the peanut crop was and is a lifesaver. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has pointed out, this crop has been cut annually and is being cut. I think the Department of Agriculture is working this out now to the point where there is not going to be any loss, but I think it might be well also to understand that all during World War II it was a mighty good thing that they had some peanuts or they would not have had any oils with which to cook, and it has now been discovered that peanut oil is one of the finest cooking oils in the world and possessed of great medicinal value. If we get into an all-out war those people in the cities may be mighty glad, mighty glad that this amendment is voted down, because it may be the means of providing some food and some sustenance that they would not otherwise be able to get.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to commend the gentleman on his fight against this amendment. I assure the gentleman that I am against the amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I wish also to join in commending the gentleman for his fine statement. He deserves the thanks of the peanut growers in particular and the country at large in general.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I should like to add my word of commendation to the others on the splendid statement the gentleman from Georgia has just made. It is a clarion call in the interest of the farmers; I think he had made a splendid contribution, and I am confident his position will be justified by the vote of this House.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just made inquiry at the desk for a copy of the hearings on this bill, H. R. 8122, and I am advised that they are not available, that there are no printed hearings. May I inquire of the chairman of the committee where copies of the hearings may be obtained?

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that the hearings were not printed.

Mr. CANFIELD. Why were they not printed?

Mr. COOLEY. For one thing, there was the time element involved. We were anxious to call the bill up for consideration. We tried to call it up by unanimous consent, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] objected. I do not think the hearings would be very helpful to the gentleman. They are available. I can have them brought here but that would result in a further delay. If the gentleman has any questions in mind with regard to what was said at the hearing I am sure some member of the committee can give him the information.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to the gentleman, who is chairman of this very important Committee on Agriculture, that I think on a measure like this hearings should be available to all Members of Congress on request.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman may be right, but we passed this morning three bills that came out of the committee because they were noncontroversial, and we thought this bill was noncontroversial, notwithstanding the opposition of Mr. Kline of the American Farm Bureau. We assumed it would be noncontroversial when every Republican on the committee and every Democrat on the committee agreed that this

is the thing they wanted to do and the thing that should be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, although I represent a city district, as a member of the Agricultural Committee I have supported every bill out of my committee excepting the migratory farm-labor bill. I think my record clearly shows my interest in sound agricultural legislation. I spoke here in favor of a bill to increase the acreage allotment for peanuts and also in support of a bill to raise the standard upon which the price supports for cotton are determined. I think the committee itself should deal with this peanut question, but I do not think the committee will. The gentleman from Ohio has pointed out how relatively unimportant peanuts are in the agricultural economy of the United States. He has pointed out also that they are in a sense a perishable commodity, and if they are deserving of any treatment, they should be treated as other perishables.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Someone made a statement—I believe it was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]—that we might be glad some day if we had peanuts available for their oil content. Was it not brought out in the testimony that if this oil is required it can be obtained at no cost to the taxpayers from soybeans and other oil-bearing products?

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman is right. I would like to make this point with regard to the perishable question. Until 1941, section 32 funds were used to support peanuts. Under the law these funds can be used only to purchase perishable commodities. After 1941, peanuts were listed as a basic commodity.

Further demonstrating the perishable nature of peanuts is the fact that up to this crop-year no inventory of peanuts has been carried over by the CCC, as is usually done with basic storable crops. Rather, they have all been sold by the Government for crushing. In the case of edible peanuts, this represents a direct subsidy to the farmer, because he is paid the support price for edible peanuts and the Government immediately sells them at the lower price paid for oil peanuts. Hence, Wooley's reference to subsidized peanuts for oil.

Now, to answer the gentleman from Ohio, this is the testimony of Mr. Wooley, former Deputy Administrator, PMA, on February 8, 1951:

Mr. WOOLEY. We are still, as of today, with the present oil market, losing in the neighborhood of \$35 to \$40 a ton on oil peanuts.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not entirely possible that an ample supply of oil peanuts may well be highly desirable from the standpoint of the country?

Mr. WOOLEY. We are of the opinion that we can get the production of oil in this country much more cheaply than we can through peanuts. We believe that through cottonseed and soybeans and other oilseed crops that we can do it more cheaply than

we can through subsidized peanuts for oil. Basically, some of that acreage that is devoted to the production of peanuts for oil we think could be well devoted to the production of feed that would result in a more profitable use of our short land resources at this particular time.

The Department of Agriculture is against subsidizing peanuts for oil and states that this cropland could be put to more profitable use.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does the gentleman make the statement that soy bean oil produces an oil that is anywhere near equal to peanut oil?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going into the physical or chemical characteristics. I am simply giving you the statement of Mr. Wooley of the PMA who says that the oil needs of this country can better be supplied from other sources than from peanuts. If you want to raise peanuts, you can raise them, but I do not think you ought to ask the Government to subsidize you in producing oil that we do not need, on a soil that the Department says could better be used for other purposes. If you want to raise peanuts, raise peanuts, but do not ask the Government to underwrite them. It appears that this oil program is unnecessary and that other crops can be raised on the land now used in raising peanuts. There seems to me to be no valid reason for continuing to support peanuts or to consider them as a basic commodity. I am satisfied, if any Member of the Committee on Agriculture were asked to define a basic commodity, he could not by the widest stretch of the imagination include peanuts, unless he included 99 percent of the agricultural commodities produced in this country. There are many other commodities, dairy products, oats, rye, barley, and so forth, that are more basic.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to ask the gentleman, in all spirit of fairness, since the question of peanut oil as against soy bean oil has arisen, if it is not a fact that it is recognized by the medical world and by the scientific world that peanut oil possesses qualities that no other oil in this world possesses? Is that not true?

Mr. McCARTHY. The same thing can be said about castor oil, but I do not think we should stockpile that simply because it is different from other kinds of oil. I believe that the House should take this nonbasic commodity off the list of basic commodities and then pass the bill as amended.

(Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I said when I was recognized, that I rose to oppose the amendment. I am sure my southern friends will not shout me down with the phrase vote! vote! vote! had they known that. I think my State antecedent got them off of balance for just a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to support agricultural legislation. Cer-

tainly, this is their weakest case, as the gentleman from Ohio indicates. If I support this program, then I will follow my distinguished friend from North Carolina on these matters as usual. But, I am doing this, Mr. Chairman, because I am being consistent. I bow to the opinion and the experience and the awareness of the subject of the members of this committee. This is their problem, and because of the procedure of this House and the way we operate here and because the work is left to the committee, perforce we must follow their advice.

Now, the number of bales of cotton yield per acre in my district is very, very, very small, believe me. The number of peanuts, the pounds of tobacco that we get from my coal mines would not fill your hat. Yet I come here year after year baring my breast to the slings and arrows of the outraged farm districts, and vote for them. But it is a one-way street, boys, it is a one-way street.

Yes; my miners will go very hungry if you do not produce food. But, my friends, that is not the argument. We cannot live without the farmers. Anybody who would suggest that ought to have his head examined, and nobody is if he is sober, I am sure. But what happens to you when we bring to your attention our problems? Why do you otherwise charming, gracious, intelligent, patriotic, and learned gentlemen tell us how to run the coal mines, tell us how to house our poor, our starving in our great cities? Why do you not reciprocate and take our advice on matters affecting our areas which at least are equally as important to the general welfare as your farm areas—for we are the consumers—we must also live.

You point to me in the great debates on the control bill for years and you get down and thunder at me that I am a Socialist if I support liberal legislation. DANIEL JOHN FRANCIS JOSEPH FLOOD a Socialist. What double-barreled nonsense. I would never vote for any Socialist legislation, and you know it. Housing for the poor in the great cities. That is not socialism—that is Americanism. I have no great cities, but I have working people who need your help. We need your help badly for work and safety. My friends have gone through this aisle shoulder to shoulder for you year after year. We ask you for bread, you farmers, and you give us stones.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. To the greatest friend the farmer has, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], of course.

Mr. PRESTON. In this year of 1952, when politics is abroad in the land everywhere, I am grateful for that splendid compliment from one of the ablest men in the Congress.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, go on.

Mr. PRESTON. It has been my pleasure to serve on a subcommittee on appropriations, seated just to the left of the gentleman who is in the well of the House. Unquestionably he has one of the keenest intellects of any Member of

the House. He is one of the ablest men to ever represent the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania. I am saying these things with the greatest of sincerity. But I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he did not inadvertently state when he took the floor that he was supporting the amendment? As a matter of fact, I believe, judging by the remarks the gentleman has made, he is in fact supporting the bill rather than the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Out of my enthusiasm, that was a complete inadvertence. I am supporting not only the bill, but I am supporting the gentleman from North Carolina and then the bill, of course.

Mr. PRESTON. May I point out that in his remarks a moment ago, he made some slight, very courteous reference to the fact that certain Members from the South sometimes do not vote on measures that are important to his area in a manner that would be pleasing to his people, but may I say that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives from the South have supported public housing. There are some in each State who have not. I have voted for public housing on every single occasion it has been before this Congress, and the majority of my delegation have done likewise. We feel for you and your problems, and hope to reciprocate for the generosity you have shown.

(At the request of Mr. EBERHARTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have just come from testifying before the Committee on Rules with many of you Members on both sides of the aisle in behalf of that vital and important legislation, the mine safety bill. Now will you look into year hearts and vote, and will the gentleman from Georgia preach the gospel in the ears of all our friends from the South to support that mine-safety legislation when it comes on this floor as we are going to support you today? Now this is a ball game—let us play it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the mine safety bill which was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor after practically 4 years of consideration, and reported out by a great majority, a measure which both sides of the aisle favor, has already had four different hearings before the Committee on Rules, and we do not know yet whether we are going to get a rule, so that the House can vote on that bill. The bill passed the other body, and I am sure it would pass here under suspension of the rules. Yet there have been four different sessions before the Committee on Rules, and we are not able to bring that bill on the floor of the House up to this late date. I think that is something that should be considered by the Members from States which pro-

duce coal, and where thousands and thousands are being maimed every year and have been for many, many years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia and acting chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman agree with me that the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is an unfair statement in that it reflects upon the Committee on Rules. Let me say that this bill has not yet been printed; the report on it has not yet been filed. Yet, in spite of the fact that the committee does not ordinarily consider an application for a rule on a bill upon which no report has been filed, the committee was immediately assembled to give consideration to the application for a rule. In the hearing opportunity was given first to the proponents of the measure. We heard the main advocates of the bill on the first day. Then because of the impossibility of proceeding further and running until night, the committee was adjourned over in order to give the opposition an opportunity to be heard. We heard them, and then we turned the hearing over to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], representing the advocates of the bill, and let him handle it in his own manner.

Mr. FLOOD. That is a proper statement.

Mr. COX. The Committee on Rules has done everything possible to cooperate in speeding up the consideration of the bill. Is that not true, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I think under any and all circumstances, we should be fair to the committee and to the membership of the House of Representatives. The Committee on Rules has cooperated with the Committee on Education and Labor, and under great difficulties. I presented the bill to the committee, and they have been most considerate and most cooperative. They have not been out of session more than a few minutes. I presented the matter to the Committee on Rules. If anyone should have an objection or complaint to file with the Committee on Rules, I think it should be some member on the committee. We found them most cooperative.

Mr. FLOOD. I have just come from the Committee on Rules, and in fairness to the gentleman who just spoke, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and in fairness to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], acting chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], handling the bill before the Committee on Rules, just finished 10 minutes ago, may I point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a very eloquent statement in my presence before the Committee on Rules thanking them for the extensive opportunity we had.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

(On request of Mr. Cox, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Flood was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is now on the floor. I have requested him to make answer to the criticism made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The situation as recounted by the chairman of the Rules Committee is substantially in effect just exactly what has happened. The committee first heard us Saturday morning. Then they carried it over, due to the lateness of the hour, until 10 o'clock this morning. The committee was in session until noon and again recessed until 2 o'clock. Both the proponents and the opponents of the legislation had ample opportunity and courteous opportunity to be heard. The proponents, of which I happen to be one, are entirely satisfied with the treatment accorded us by the Committee on Rules. I am sure the opponents of the legislation had adequate time and opportunity to be heard.

Mr. COX. One more word.

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. COX. The committee had to adjourn because we did not have a quorum present and because of proceedings on the floor in which Members were interested we could not get a quorum this afternoon. The final meeting is set for consideration in executive session tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to criticize any individual member of the Rules Committee. Some of my best friends are members of the Rules Committee. I appreciate very deeply the concern with which they are treating this request from the Committee on Education and Labor, to allow the membership of the House to vote on whether or not we should have a mine-safety law.

This is a very important measure. It means safety for thousands upon thousands of coal miners in the United States; it means life or death to many, as you know by the very serious accidents that have occurred during the past couple of years and particularly during the past several months.

Of course, if the Rules Committee takes it upon itself to set itself up as a supercommittee to go into every phase of legislation which has been reported out by a legislative committee, if the Rules Committee seeks, after the majority and the minority members have given consideration and approval to a measure, and has the approval of this House to go over the bill as reported out by the legislative committee, and therefore is given the power to veto in the last

few days of the session a measure in which the entire coal-mining fraternity are very much interested, and a large percentage of the operators also favor and are interested, I say that if the House approves of that method of operation by the Rules Committee, that is one thing. I am glad I brought this subject up. I think it is a matter worthy of consideration. Here we are on Monday. We expect to adjourn sine die not later than Saturday. A request for a rule has been before this highly rated Rules Committee for several days. I am beginning to get concerned as to whether or not we are going to get a rule. I am beginning to get concerned as to whether the Rules Committee will not say, when we come to the last few days of the session, "If you will put so and so proviso in that bill we will give you a rule. If you do not put so and so a proviso in the bill we will not give you a rule." What will the miners all over the State of Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, and other States that produce and mine coal think about a proposition like that?

Mr. Chairman, I am glad I brought this subject up. I am willing to debate it at any time with anybody.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. If I am on a committee and I think if any other Member of this House is on a committee, and both the majority and the minority, after considering a bill for many, many months and days, then report it out practically unanimously, to allow a supercommittee to stand up and say, "You do thus and so or we will not give you a rule," I do not think we are living up to our obligation as the voters expect us to do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, this attack on the Rules Committee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is nothing new, for he has been assaulting and lecturing the Rules Committee for a good many years; I do not know why, but those of you who have been here several terms will remember that he brought the matter to the attention of the House some three or four sessions ago and succeeded in passing the kind of resolution that he thought would clip the wings of the Rules Committee and get them to come nearer doing his bidding. That operated through that Congress, and it was found so unsatisfactory that the membership itself revolted against that rule and again restored to the Committee on Rules the former rules of the House.

I know that the Committee on Rules cannot do everything that everybody wants done at all times; it is just humanly impossible; but I think it very unfair to come here on the floor of the House and make this kind of assault on the Committee on Rules which has a rather difficult situation under the best conditions.

As to this so-called mine-safety bill, I think that in view of what has been said the House ought to know what are

the actual facts on that bill. Everybody knows that Federal mine-safety legislation has been a subject that has been kicking around this Congress for a great many years. We are now 5 days from the end of this session. Not several days ago, but 1 day ago, Saturday, the Rules Committee was asked to meet and to give a hearing to this mine-safety bill. We met; we have been meeting pretty much all the time ever since. At the time that bill was presented to the Rules Committee I think the Committee on Education and Labor had had 2 years to work on it; we did not even have a printed bill before us; we had a committee print of what this legislation is. Up to this moment no member of the Rules Committee, no Member of the House of Representatives has an official printed copy of that bill, because it has not been printed. Up to Saturday when that bill came before the committee, up to today when that committee has been sitting all day on it, and up to this very moment, no Member of the House has seen or had a copy of the report of the committee on that bill with the statement of why the bill should be enacted.

I do not criticize anybody; everybody has been busy; but certainly criticism should not be directed to the Rules Committee which has devoted 2 days to this thing without even having an official copy of the bill and without even having any copy of the report of the committee on the bill.

That is the true situation relative to the mine-safety bill. We have labored with it for 2 days. I understand the acting chairman has adjourned the committee until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock at which time he hopes to have a quorum present; and may we hope that at that time the Rules Committee may have an official print of the bill and that we may have a copy of the report.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me assure the gentleman from Virginia that there is no criticism coming from the members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman from West Virginia is not criticizing; and the gentleman from West Virginia has been very fair about it and the Rules Committee is trying to be fair; we have tried to hear everybody who wanted to be heard, and we have now succeeded in hearing everybody who wanted to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee should not be criticized and I know that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor are not criticizing us.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it permissible under the rules of the House for the author of an amendment to speak twice on his amendment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rose in opposition to the pro forma amendment, not my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. I ask for a vote on the pending amendment, Mr. Chairman; there is no pro forma amendment pending; the pro forma amendments have been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina can fix the time for limitation of debate after the gentleman has completed.

Mr. COOLEY. It was not a question of fixing time. It was a parliamentary inquiry if the gentleman could be recognized twice on the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this House in my interest in the mine-safety bill. I have between 75 and 80 percent of all the coal miners in the great coal-producing State of Ohio within my district.

In my belief, the Members of this body will get a chance to vote on the mine-safety bill because it is my understanding that the majority leader has announced he plans to bring the bill up under suspension of the rules. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is correct. May I say for the benefit of the Members and the RECORD that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has agreed. Of course, we get permission to bring up a bill under suspension by unanimous consent and under these conditions the recognition would be as the result of an agreement on the part of the leadership. It is understood that the Speaker will recognize on Wednesday a motion to suspend the rules and consider the mine-safety bill; however, we are anxious to get a rule just the same. The Committee on Rules met as a result of the request of the leadership to try and get a rule out. We are going to bring it up under suspension because I assert this is a "must" bill, then have a rule to resort to in case it is necessary. I hope the Rules Committee will report out a rule.

The Rules Committee, of course, need not feel very much disturbed about what my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said. His statement was based upon good faith, but the facts are only known to a few. We know him to be a hard fighter and a very sincere Representative of the people of his district. It has been a subject near and close to his heart for many years.

I want to emphasize again that I consider this "must" legislation and I hope the Rules Committee will report a rule. It will come up under suspension of the rules and a rule will be available, if reported.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

A lot of Members have come on the floor since I introduced my original amendment which would take peanuts out of politics. My amendment is one to strike peanuts out of the fixed 90-percent section of the parity bill. I

merely say this for the benefit of those who came in since the discussion got onto the subject of coal. I did not base it on the fact I was out to punish any section of the country because I emphasized when I introduced the amendment that I am farmer, I believe in the farm program, but the weakest link in the farm program is here and it is the thing that is costing the taxpayers the most money. On the basis of figures we have for the years 1933 to 1951 it appears that peanuts has been the commodity that cost \$14,000,000 more than any other commodity while it has less acreage than any commodity except rice.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to point out in connection with what the majority leader said that, as I understand it, the minority agreement was simply that suspensions be in order on Wednesday, but the suspensions that are to be called up is wholly a matter for the Speaker to determine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that necessarily follows. I think my friend from Indiana will interpret what I said in the proper light, that where your leadership consented to a suspension out of order it is only natural that we should consult your leadership in connection with what bills would come up. It is not a regular suspension day which would allow suspensions.

Mr. HALLECK. The agreement is necessary because suspensions would not under the rules, be in order on Wednesday except by unanimous consent?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and would not ordinarily come up until next Monday, when we will be out of here.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio relative to the cost figures he just cited, that a large part of those costs was entailed as the result of the so-called excess-oil program in the peanut field, and that was later corrected by legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is trying to present his argument in the case fairly for peanuts, because he is interested in the welfare of his district. But, I would like to say that for this year we lost \$7,500,000 on peanuts. In closing may I say that while I am vitally interested in coal, as a lot of other Members are, the bill before us is an agricultural bill, and the amendment we are about to vote on is a peanut amendment to strike peanuts out from under the 90-percent section of the parity program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio should not be considered in connection with the legislation now before the House. I grant you that there have been difficulties in the peanut program. There has been too lost in the program. But, I think the way to correct that is with legislation from the Committee on Agriculture, which I have advocated from time to time. It is a fact that peanuts are not a perishable commodity. Peanuts can be stored and peanuts can be kept so that they can be marketed in an orderly fashion in accordance with the necessity of the trade and the consuming public. I do hope the House will not support this amendment and give the agricultural committee an opportunity to further study this legislation to work out the existing and difficult problems in the oil program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that losses were sustained because our Government urged and requested the farmers to substantially increase acreage during the war emergency?

Mr. BONNER. That is true; during the war years the crop was increased due to a request by the Fats and Oils Commission of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think to set the record straight we should make the point that the big losses occurred in 1949, 1950, and 1951, which was after the war, and we had a lot of time to revise that peanut program since then.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; and I have been anxious to get a revision of the program, and I think that if a lot of the things in this program are properly ironed out, we will not have this loss.

Mr. McCARTHY. This amendment will not take peanuts out but they would be subjected to a sliding scale which Congress decided should apply.

Mr. BONNER. Well, this amendment will take peanuts out as one of the basic commodities, and I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio), there were—ayes 43, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DEMPSEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House

Resolution 705, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Aandahl	Evins	Morton
Abernethy	Fallon	Moulder
Albert	Fenton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Frazier	Passman
Anderson, Calif.	Furcolo	Philbin
Anfuso	Gore	Potter
Auchincloss	Granger	Poulson
Bakewell	Gwinn	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Hall	Ramsay
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Reece, Tenn.
Beckworth	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Harden	Richards
Bender	Hébert	Riley
Blackney	Heffernan	Sabath
Brehm	Herter	Sasscer
Brown, Ohio	Heslton	Scott, Hardie
Brownson	Jones	Short
Buckley	Hamilton C.	Sikes
Burdick	Judd	Steed
Camp	Kearney	Stigler
Carlyle	Kee	Sutton
Carnahan	Kersten, Wis.	Tackett
Chiperfield	Kilday	Taylor
Cole, N. Y.	Larcade	Vinson
Combs	LeCompte	Welch
Coudert	Lyle	Wharton
Curtis, Nebr.	McVey	Whitten
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, Md.	Wickersham
Dawson	Mitchell	Withrow
Dingell	Morgan	Wood, Ga.
Doughton	Morris	Woodruff
Eaton	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, roll call No. 125, as I understand it, shows that I did not vote. I was present and voted "aye" and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JAVITS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 79, noes 165.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused. So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 121, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—207

Abbott	Forrester	Murdock
Adair	Fugate	Murray
Allen, Ill.	Gary	Norrell
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	O'Brien, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	George	O'Hara
Andrews	Golden	O'Konski
Angell	Gordon	O'Neill
Arends	Grant	Patman
Armstrong	Gregory	Patten
Asplund	Gross	Perkins
Ayres	Hagen	Phillips
Bailey	Hall	Pickett
Baker	Leonard W.	Poage
Barden	Halleck	Polk
Baring	Hardy	Preston
Battle	Harris	Price
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Priest
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Va.	Prouty
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Wyo.	Rabaut
Bentsen	Hart	Rains
Berry	Harvey	Rankin
Betts	Havener	Redden
Bishop	Hays, Ark.	Rees, Kans.
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Rhodes
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Rivers
Bolling	Herlong	Roberts
Bolton	Hill	Robeson
Bonner	Hoeven	Rogers, Colo.
Bosone	Holmes	Rogers, Fla.
Boykin	Hope	Rogers, Tex.
Bramblett	Horan	Rooney
Bray	Hull	Schriener
Brooks	Hunter	Secrest
Brown, Ga.	Ikard	Shafer
Bryson	Irving	Sheppard
Budge	Jackson, Wash.	Sieminski
Burleson	Jarman	Simpson, Ill.
Burnside	Jenison	Smith, Kans.
Burton	Jenkins	Smith, Miss.
Butler	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Byrnes	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Wis.
Cannon	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Chatham	Jones, Woodrow W.	Springer
Chelf	Karsten, Mo.	Staggers
Chenoweth	Kelley, Pa.	Stanley
Clevenger	Kerr	Stockman
Colmer	King, Calif.	Talle
Cooley	Kirwan	Teague
Cooper	Kluczynski	Thomas
Crosser	Lanham	Thornberry
Crumpacker	Lantaff	Trimble
Cunningham	LeCompte	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	Lesinski	Velde
Davis, Wis.	Lovre	Vursell
Deane	Lucas	Walter
DeGraffenried	McCarthy	Watts
Dempsey	McCormack	Weichel
Denton	McCulloch	Werdel
D'Ewart	McGregor	Whitten
Dolliver	McKinnon	Wler
Dorn	McMillan	Williams, Miss.
Doyle	McMullen	Williams, N. Y.
Durham	Machrowicz	Wilson, Ind.
Elliott	Mack, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Engle	Magee	Winstead
Fernandez	Mahon	Withrow
Fisher	Mansfield	Wood, Idaho
Flood	Martin, Iowa	Yorty
	Miller, Nebr.	Zablocki
	Mills	

NAYS—121

Addonizio	Granahan	Nelson
Allen, Calif.	Greenwood	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Hale	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Heller	Osmer
Bates, Mass.	Hess	Ostertag
Boggs, Del.	Hillings	O'Toole
Bow	Hinsaw	Patterson
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson
Buffett	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Busbey	Hollifield	Reams
Bush	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Ribicoff
Carrigg	James	Riehlman
Case	Javits	Rodino
Celler	Johnson	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Jonas	Roosevelt
Clemente	Kean	Ross
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Sadlak
Corbett	Keating	St. George
Cotton	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Crawford	Kennedy	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Scott
Dague	King, Pa.	Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Klein	Scudder
Devereux	Lane	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	Latham	Sheehan
Dondero	Lind	Shelley
Donohue	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	McDonough	Sittler
Eberharter	McGrath	Taber
Elston	McGuire	Thompson, Mich.
Feighan	McIntire	Tollefson
Fine	Mack, Wash.	Vail
Fogarty	Madden	Van Zandt
Forand	Meador	Vorrs
Ford	Merrow	Widnall
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Gamble	Morano	Wolcott
Gavin	Multer	Wolverton
Goodwin	Mumma	Yates
Graham	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—103

Aandahl	Fallon	Morris
Abernethy	Fenton	Morrison
Albert	Frazier	Morton
Allen, La.	Furcolo	Moulder
Anfuso	Garmatz	Norblad
Bakewell	Gore	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Granger	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Green	Philbin
Beall	Gwinn	Potter
Beckworth	Hall	Powell
Belcher	Edwin Arthur	Ramsay
Bender	Hand	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Harden	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Hébert	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Richards
Brownson	Herter	Riley
Buckley	Heseltan	Sabath
Burdick	Jones	Sasscer
Camp	Hamilton C.	Scott, Hardie
Carlyle	Judd	Short
Carnahan	Kearney	Sikes
Chiperfield	Kee	Steed
Chudoff	Keogh	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Sutton
Combs	Kilday	Tackett
Coudert	Larcade	Taylor
Curtis, Nebr.	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	McVey	Vinson
Dawson	Marshall	Welch
Denny	Martin, Mass.	Wharton
Dingell	Mason	Wheeler
Doughton	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Eaton	Miller, Md.	Willis
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Wood, Ga.
Evins	Morgan	Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Green against.
 Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Chudoff against.
 Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Buckley against.
 Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Heffernan against.
 Mr. Marshall for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
 Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Powell against.
 Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Coudert against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Heseltan against.
 Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Woodruff against.
 Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.
 Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Gwinn against.
 Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Taylor against.
 Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Barrett against.
 Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Judd.
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Wharton.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Larcade with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Lyle with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Fenton.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hand.
 Mr. Morris with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Potter.
 Mr. Granger with Mr. Morton.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
 Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Hamilton C. Jones with Mr. McVey.
 Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Brehm.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. Sabbath with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Brownson.
 Mr. Riley with Mr. Chipfield.
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Frazier with Mr. Bakewell.
 Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Beall.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Bender.
 Mr. Doughton with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.
 Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Norblad.
 Mr. Sutton with Mr. Herter.
 Mr. Tackett with Mr. Blackney.
 Mr. Kilday with Mr. Denny.
 Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Cole of New York.
 Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUY AMERICAN: COSTLY FALLACY

(Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my attention has on several occasions during the past few months been drawn to a law with a patriotic-sounding name. I am sure that my colleagues are with me in support of patriotic measures and will be interested in giving a little consideration to this law. It is called the Buy American Act and has been law since the last day of the Seventy-second Congress, March 3, 1933.

For these past 19 years it has had an important influence on the operations of the Government. It has affected a vast volume of purchasing by the Government agencies. Its influence has increased in proportion to the increase in Government buying and our efforts to insure that the Government agencies achieve the maximum degree of economy in their operations.

On close examination of this law with the patriotic-sounding name I find, however, it has been working at cross purposes with our efforts to cut waste, that it has frustrated the purpose of Congress to keep Government costs to the lowest minimum.

This Buy American Act of 1933, requiring Government agencies to spend on some items up to 25 percent above the price at which the items are available to the public, actually compels them to spend their appropriated funds wastefully. The act requires, generally, that goods purchased by Government agencies for use in the United States shall

be of domestic origin unless their cost is unreasonable or unless their purchase would not be in the public interest. The law itself does not define unreasonable cost. However, purchasing regulations of the Government agencies do provide a formula, based on an administrative ruling dating back to 1934, which holds that the cost of a domestic article is unreasonable only if it is more than 25 percent above the cost of the same foreign product after taking account whatever duty applies to the latter. The restriction against foreign goods applies generally to all Federal Government purchasing, including purchasing of strategic materials for stockpiling, and purchasing by non-Federal Government agencies, such as local housing bodies, if such agencies use Federal funds.

The act is clearly making nonsense of our efforts to save the taxpayers' money. Perhaps we ought not to be too harsh on the Congress which was responsible for this act, however, and should consider the circumstances of its adoption.

"BEGGAR-MY-NEIGHBOR"

It was enacted at a time when considerable support was being given not to curtailing Government expenditures, but to increasing them for the sake of decreasing unemployment. The act came about as a floor amendment to the Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Act for fiscal 1934. Like many of the measures proposed by various governments during the depression, it was in the nature of a "beggar-my-neighbor" measure. These "beggar-my-neighbor" measures attempted to stimulate domestic economic activity at the expense of other countries and, not unexpectedly, brought about similar retaliatory measures by other countries. The act is definitely a make-work law.

While the economic conditions of the early 1930's are long since past, this law remains on the books and swells the already rapidly increasing cost of Government procurement. The act was adopted during the period when Federal Government expenditures on goods and services amounted to \$2,000,000,000. Last year it applied to Federal Government expenditures on goods and services amounting to \$63,000,000,000. This year it will affect an even larger volume. This act is working at cross purposes with our efforts to achieve economy in Government, to put a brake on inflationary pressures, to stretch the defense dollar and to relieve the taxpayer to the fullest extent possible of the heavy burden which he now bears. As long as it remains in force, we shall find we are on a treadmill in trying to make progress toward economy in Government buying.

One reason perhaps that this measure has been permitted to persist so long is that its cost, while high, cannot be measured accurately. As it is applied, the act imposes such a substantial obstacle to Government purchase of imported goods, in addition to the tariff and other difficulties normally confronting traders, that it becomes almost impossible to sell foreign goods to the Government and therefore impractical to offer them. The Government, therefore, is denied the op-

portunity to compare the prices it has been paying with those it might pay. However, some Government purchases have recently drawn public attention and have pointed up to the potential savings which might be made if this restriction on Government procurement were eliminated.

SPECIFIC ILLUSTRATIONS

A recent series of Buy American cases, involving the purchase of medical microscopes, has been highly publicized and has drawn considerable interest from several committees of Congress, from various Government agencies, and from foreign governments. During 1950 and 1951 the Army awarded nine contracts for medical microscopes, six to an Italian firm and three to domestic suppliers. In each of the six cases where the award was made to the Italian firm, Galileo of Milan, the domestic microscopes were offered in sealed bidding at more than 25 percent above the price of the Italian microscopes, which included a United States tariff of 45 percent. The saving to the Army made possible by the purchase of the Italian microscopes in these six cases amounted to over \$90,000. In seven of the nine cases, the price quoted by the only two domestic firms bidding were identical although their prices varied from one bidding to the next because of different specifications and different quantities.

In bidding on contracts to supply the Veterans' Administration with microscopes, the domestic companies, not under the necessity of meeting Italian competition because of specifications serving to exclude the foreign product, were asking prices substantially in excess of the prices they were asking the Army for what were in some cases, I understand, the identical microscopes. The prices of each company, in bidding on Veterans' Administration contracts, were also identical in each case. Special notice of the similarity in bidding is given in the last annual report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

An additional order for almost 1,300 microscopes brought offers from the Galileo company and the two domestic firms. All three had been dropping their prices. On this bid the difference between Galileo's price and that of the low domestic bidder was less than the 25-percent differential which has generally been applied as the criterion of unreasonable cost under the act—actually, the lowest domestic price was 24.1 percent above the Italian price, including duty. In accordance with Defense Department procedures, the case was reviewed by the Under Secretary of the Army, who finally decided to split the award evenly between Galileo and the low domestic bidder. This meant a saving to the Army of \$40,000 over what the Department's buy-American regulations would have permitted the Army to spend. But it also meant, on the contrary, that it spent quite unnecessarily about \$40,000 more than it need have if there had been no cost-increasing Buy American Act.

MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR COST

It is, of course, impossible to make any accurate estimate of what the Buy

American Act has cost the American taxpayer. The very existence of the act has discouraged economical purchasing practices on the part of the Government. It is very reasonable to estimate that the cost has been at least \$2,000,000,000. It may have been as high as \$10,000,000,000.

The savings to the country would be greatest, however, in the indirect results reflected in a more wholesome economy within the entire free world. The other free countries, if they have a stable economy, will be better able to bear the cost of our joint security programs. The enemies of communism must be able to carry as much of their own burden as possible. The buy-American law is a symbol of the trade barriers which hamper the international cooperation the free world must have.

The economy of the free world, if it is to be mutually strengthened to fight communism, needs more foreign trade instead of more foreign aid.

It should be made quite clear that the restriction imposed under the Buy American Act against Government purchases of foreign goods is not intended as an equivalent to the tariff. With certain exceptions, the procuring agency, when it is deciding whether to purchase domestic or foreign goods, compares the foreign price, including duty, with the domestic price, as would any ordinary purchaser and actually pays the amount of the tariff included in the price of a dutiable foreign product. The Buy American Act, therefore, superimposes restrictions on Government purchasing of foreign goods additional to those already applied by the tariff laws.

AGRICULTURAL MILLSTONE

The fiction that the Buy American Act is necessary to protect the price of certain agricultural commodities has grown up over the years. It provides no such protection that cannot better be provided through the price-support program, import quota agreements, and tariff laws. The Buy American Act is a millstone for all of American agriculture. It benefits no American industry able to meet the competitive demands of the free-enterprise system.

These added restrictions have an especially undesirable effect considering our objective of increasing the production of defense equipment with as few cuts as possible in production for civilian consumption. Now, the piling of defense needs on top of civilian needs naturally causes a scarcity of many goods. While we have been trying to insure a maximum availability of defense goods, this so-called Buy American Act has been putting obstacles in the way of our getting scarce goods.

In addition to being inconsistent with our defense program, the act is at complete variance with our work to preserve competition and to support our free enterprise system. We should encourage the healthy competition between foreign and domestic goods which ordinarily takes place within the limits set by the tariff laws. When it comes to Government procurements and to spending the taxpayers' money, we find that we have

SENATE - July 4

76. PRICE SUPPORTS. Passed with amendment H. R. 8122, to continue the existing dual parity formula for basic commodities through 1955, after substituting therefor the text of S. 2115, a similar bill, which had first been amended (by a McFarland-Chavez amendment) to provide price support for long staple cotton. S. 2115 does not contain the provision, which was in H. R. 8122 as passed by the House, to require 90%-of-parity supports on basic commodities. Conferees were appointed in both Houses. (pp. 9398-408, 9410-2, 9541, 9482.)
77. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 8170, to decrease the minimum farm acreage allotments for burley tobacco (pp. 9533-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
78. SUBMARGINAL LAND. Passed with amendment H. R. 7317, authorizing conveyance of a tract of SCS submarginal land to Hope, N. Mex. The bill had been reported by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee without amendment (S. Rept. 2097). Agreed to a Morse amendment which changes the purchase price of the land from \$1,950 (the original price paid by USDA) to "the appraised fair-market value of the property". (pp. 9522, 9529, 9537-9.)
79. RECLAMATION. Reconsidered its action of July 3 in passing without amendment H. R. 6163, authorizing irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, and repassed this bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute comprising the text of S. 2320, a similar bill (pp. 9412-3).
80. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7656, the GI Bill of Rights for veterans of the Korean conflict (pp. 9453-63, 9523). This bill will now be sent to the President.
81. WATER POLLUTION. Passed without amendment H. R. 6856, extending for 3 years the Water Pollution Control Act (p. 9528). This bill will now be sent to the President.
82. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee submitted reports relating to supervisory selection (S. Rept. 2100, incentive awards program (S. Rept. 2101), and the reduction-in-force system (S. Rept. 2102) in the Federal Government (p. 9582).
83. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. O'Mahoney obtained permission to have printed as a S. Doc. a report on rural electrification in Wyo. (p. 9582).
Sen. O'Mahoney spoke in favor of adopting the conference report on H. R. 7176, the Interior appropriation bill for 1953, and stated that the passage of this measure, which contains a \$1,000,000 continuing fund for the Southwestern Power Administration, will be a "milestone in the progress of rural electrification throughout...the southwestern area" (pp. 9542-3).
84. WITHHOLDING PAY. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 1999, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into agreements with States, Territories, possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, requiring Federal agencies to comply with non-federal statutes imposing upon employers the duty of withholding State and other income taxes (pp. 9397-8). This bill will now be sent to the President.
85. PATENTS. Passed as reported H. R. 7794, to revise and codify the patent laws (p. 9534).

86. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Sen. Malone spoke in favor of returning to the gold standard (pp. 9547-77).
87. NOMINATION of Raymond Ross Paty, to be a member of the TVA Board, was confirmed (p. 9419).
88. FARM LOANS; PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Moody inserted his report on various aspects of farm policy wherein he favored price supports but recommended that a system of "mutual price insurance" should be thoroughly explored as "one alternative," and that the expansion of FHA activities "could do a lot toward putting many low-income farmers on their feet" (pp. 9408-10).
89. FOREIGN AID; EXPENDITURES. Sen. Ken inserted a table showing per-capita cost of foreign aid in Mo. and spoke against high taxation and foreign expenditures (pp. 9413-5).
90. SUGAR. Ratified two protocols prolonging the international sugar agreement through Aug. 1952 (Exec. I and O, 82nd Cong.) in order to continue the administrative framework provided for in the agreement until a revision of it can be negotiated (pp. 9425-6).
91. AIR-POLLUTION RESEARCH. Discussed and passed over, on the objection of Sen. Welker, H. J. Res. 218, to provide for research on air pollution (pp. 9525-6).
92. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Discussed and passed over, on the objection of Sen. Welker, S. J. Res. 157, granting consent for certain States to enter into compacts with Canada for development of the St. Lawrence waterway (pp. 9526-7).
93. FARM LABOR. As received, S. Doc. 152 proposes a supplemental appropriation of \$2,000,000 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice Department, to aid in the recruitment program of agricultural workers from Mexico by preventing illegal entry of aliens (June 30).

BILLS INTRODUCED - July 4

94. PERSONNEL. S. 3477, by Sen. Johnston, and H. R. 8528, by Rep. Miller of Calif., to provide severance pay to certain Federal officers and employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committees (pp. 9390, 9517).

EXPENDITURES.

95. BUDGETING; S. 3482, by Sen. Ferguson, to establish a legislative bureau for the audit, analysis and review of Federal Government programs and projects for the purpose of making recommendations to the Congress with respect to the elimination of unnecessary, wasteful and extravagant activities and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, public or private, those government functions which they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than the Federal Government; to Government Operations Committee (p. 9391). Remarks of author and text of bill (pp. 9442-4).

RECLAMATION.

96. ELECTRIFICATION; H. J. Res. 496, by Rep. Magee, authorizing an inquiry by FTC into certain practices and activities of private companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of electric energy in interstate commerce; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 9517).
- S. 3486, by Sen. Malone, to eliminate the requirement that certain preference be given with respect to the sublease of power privileges leased from the Interior Department; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 9583).
- S. 3487, by Sen. Malone, authorizing a dam on the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to Public Works Committee (p. 9583). Remarks of author and text of

head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That where—

(1) the law of any State or Territory provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State or Territory, and

(2) such duty to withhold is imposed generally with respect to the compensation of employees who are residents of such State or Territory.

then the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State or Territory. Such agreement shall provide that the head of such department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax and whose regular place of Federal employment is within the State or Territory with which such agreement is entered into. No such agreement shall apply with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Sec. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application of any provision of law which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability by reason of the provisions of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, with the recommendation of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cain	Douglas
Bennett	Capehart	Dworshak
Benton	Case	Eastland
Brewster	Chavez	Eaton
Bridges	Clements	Ellender
Butler, Md.	Connally	Ferguson
Butler, Nebr.	Cordon	Flanders

Frear	Kilgore	O'Connor
George	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Gillette	Langer	Pastore
Green	Lehman	Russell
Hayden	Long	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Hennings	Malone	Smathers
Hickenlooper	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Hill	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Hoey	McCarran	Sparkman
Holland	McCarthy	Stennis
Humphrey	McClellan	Taft
Hunt	McFarland	Thye
Ives	McKellar	Underwood
Jenner	Monroney	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	Moody	Welker
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Williams
Kem	Murray	Young
Kerr	Neely	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent because of official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, last night after I had left the Senate Chamber the majority leader, after conferring with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who had previously objected to calendar No. 1070, House bill 5243, to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, asked for the immediate consideration of the bill, and the bill was passed.

There had been a previous conversation between the chairman of the Finance Committee and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who wished to continue to insist upon his objection to the bill.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would advise the Senator that the bill has been sent to the House, and the House will have to be asked to return the papers. Then a motion to reconsider will be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the appropriate motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia moves that the House be asked to return the papers to the Senate. The Senator may follow the return of the papers with a motion to reconsider.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to state my reason for my objection yesterday. Mr. Howard Robertson of the Defense Department called me and stated that we are producing in this country only 20 percent of the tungsten needed for defense purposes, and we are importing 80 percent. Certainly it seems to me that the bill should be passed. The duty on tungsten raises the cost of it to \$63 a ton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has not made a unanimous-consent request. He has made a motion.

Mr. LANGER. I understand. I want to explain why I changed my mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to be recognized?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that when the tungsten matter came up my mind flashed to the wool situation. At the present time all over the country the warehouses are filled with domestic wool. In my State there are nearly 5,000,000 pounds in one warehouse. At the same time the Army is buying from Argentina and other South American countries, and also from Australia. Our domestic producers are not raising sheep and not producing wool because of the foreign competition.

When the tungsten matter came up I objected because it gave me an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the desperate situation which confronts the wool grower in the United States.

When I was informed by the Defense Department what the situation was with respect to tungsten, I promptly withdrew my objection. I believe the bill should be passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I did not know of the later objection. At first, objection was made by the Senator from North Dakota. He withdrew the objection. I spoke with the minority leader, but evidently he did not know about the second objection either. If I had known of the objection, I would not have asked unanimous consent to consider the bill. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] certainly would have been entitled to notice. Therefore, under the circumstances, I think it is no more than fair that the bill should be brought back from the House and disposed of in some other way, if it can be disposed of. Certainly

In five seizure cases the Government moved in because of refusal of the company to deliver war material at fair and reasonable prices, unacceptable quality of product, inefficient management or failure to maintain production schedules for reasons other than a labor dispute.

Damages awarded by the courts to private owners of seized facilities have run up to a total of nearly \$8,000,000, including interest. Most of this total represents awards to 93 motor carriers on claims that originally totaled \$50,000,000. Six motor-carrier claims still are pending.

Three coal-mine seizure cases, involving claims of \$290,000, still are pending in the Court of Claims.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF IMPRISONMENT OF WILLIAM N. OATIS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, exactly 1 year has elapsed since William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, was sentenced by Communist rulers in Czechoslovakia.

Before the Eighty-second Congress passes into history it would seem pertinent to remind Members of the Senate that while today will bring to an end this second session of the present Congress it will mark only the beginning of a second year of imprisonment for a loyal American citizen and newsman who now is unjustly confined in a Czechoslovakian prison. Mr. Oatis was sentenced, as I am sure many here will recall, by a Czechoslovakian court on this day of last year. Charges of espionage which the whole world knows were entirely without foundation were the pretext on which he was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment.

As we prepare to disperse to homes throughout the country, let us give thought to the plight of Mr. Oatis and to his chances of emerging sound and healthy, or even alive, from his place of confinement. Every day he spends in his prison cell is but another insult added to the many which our Communist foes delight in heaping upon anyone or anything representative of the United States of America.

It seems proper, particularly, for us to consider what steps have been taken or are in process, to effect his release. One thing we do know is that whatever steps have been taken have been completely unsuccessful and that, to all intents and purposes, there would seem as little hope for speedy release of Mr. Oatis today as when he was so flagrant a victim of Communist tyranny a year ago today.

We talk of the United Nations as the one medium through which world peace can be achieved. Our experience, and our lack of success, in freeing Mr. Oatis from the effects of the injustices visited upon him gives little cause for hope as to the eventual achievement of world peace. Such incidents as the Oatis trial and sentence offer dramatic testimony of the large-scale injustices visited upon millions of unfortunate residents of the countries now under Soviet rule. If the concerted weight of free world opinion cannot effect the release of one man whose imprisonment is so palpably un-

justified, what basis would there seem to be for hope that we could ever arrive at any understanding based on justice with nations and leaders who make injustice rather than justice their basic policy, and, in addition, seek out ways and means to impress their enslaved peoples with the impotence of the United States to protect its nationals against Communist violence?

As I have pointed out time and again, this country permits known subversives from enemy countries to enter and roam the Nation at will, while our people in Communist-dominated countries, if not subjected to indignities or injustices as was Oatis, are harassed and restricted in innumerable ways. I am convinced that the longer we submit to these indignities without drastic retaliatory measures, the less chance we ever will have to arrive at just and decent agreements with such lawless countries.

We have been told that we cannot take too drastic action, but that does not help at all to resolve the situation. Maybe the time has come to start doing some of the things which we are told must not be done. Perhaps we can find a way to impress upon Communist leaders that there will be redress for violence against our people. It may be possible that procedures which our State Department has not seen fit to use would be effective, where accepted diplomatic approaches have failed.

We cannot leave this session with the feeling that we have really disposed of all the problems facing us, when we realize that our Government has failed to do anything to help Bill Oatis. His pride in his American citizenship must be at a low ebb, indeed. In a previous discussion of this important matter in the Senate on July 17, 1951, I advocated the adoption by the Senate of a resolution that would urge upon the State Department and upon other Government agencies to prevent representatives of the free Communist press from dispatching, forwarding, or gathering news and information in the United States for the governments or news agencies of the Communist countries; make suitable representation to the United Nations for consideration of the Oatis case by that body; prohibit trade between citizens of the United States and Czechoslovakia until the release of Mr. Oatis.

I am strongly of the belief that summary action should be taken so that Mr. Oatis and all freedom-loving people throughout the world may know that American principles and American rights will be upheld.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 237, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate

and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1952.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

Mr. HAYDEN. The suggested procedure would be very advantageous in that it would save a great deal of paper and documentation.

I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING OF STATE INCOME TAXES BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the

it cannot be disposed of under a unanimous-consent agreement. I hope the papers will be returned from the House.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to debate the question for a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

NECESSITY FOR ORDER IN THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the last days of the session there is a natural tendency for confusion to exist in the Chamber. In order that legislation which must be acted upon may be considered and consummated in an orderly manner, the Chair will ask all Senators to cooperate in preserving order. It is difficult to transact the business of the Senate when every Senator is talking and transacting business in his own personal capacity.

The Chair asks the occupants of the gallery to cooperate in preserving order. The Senate appreciates their interest in the proceedings, but the Chair asks their cooperation by not talking.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the early part of this year the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on three bills. The purpose of the first bill S. 450, was to encourage expanded production of needed nonbasic agricultural commodities. It was patterned after the so-called Steagall amendment which was adopted during World War II.

The second bill, S. 2115, sought to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic commodities by using both the old formula, and the new formulas.

The third bill, S. 2996, introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KEEL], provided 100 percent of parity price supports on all major commodities, basic and nonbasic.

After holding hearings for four days the committee decided to take no action on S. 450 and S. 2996, and reported unanimously S. 2115 with an amendment.

The sole purpose of S. 2115 as amended, is to continue the present law with regard to the use of the dual parity formula in fixing parity prices for the basic commodities for a period of 2 years following December 31, 1953. While the Department of Agriculture objected to a permanent extension of the dual parity system for the basic commodities, the Department later submitted a report to the committee stating that it would be unwise to permit a sharp drop in the price support levels for the basic commodities at this time and that one way to avoid this was to continue the dual parity system through 1955.

The purpose of the pending bill, H. R. 8122 in one of its provisions, is the same as that of S. 2115, indeed, the language is identical. In addition the House bill adds another section, section 2.

The purpose of section 2 is to make the level of support prices to cooperators 90 percent of parity for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955 in the case of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.

The committee refused to approve the second portion of the bill, with reference to making mandatory 90 percent support prices for 3 years, because of opposition in committee. Several Senators from both sides of the aisle objected to the proposal. A further reason was that the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law as it is now written, has the right and power to fix support prices at 90 percent of parity.

I now offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of the pending House bill and to insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2115. The amendment will be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 8122, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, to the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] an amendment with reference to long staple cotton, which I hope the Senate will accept. Long-staple cotton is a strategic material, and for it there is needed a better program than the one provided by the Munitions Board, and one on which the producers can rely. I hope the Senator will take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to will be reconsidered, in order that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute may be considered.

The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can state in substance what the amendment to the amendment provides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reading of the amendment to the amendment will be dispensed with.

The amendment submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. CHA-

VEZ) to Mr. ELLENDER's amendment in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

At the end of the bill to insert:

"SEC. —. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such act, as follows:

"“(f) The provisions of this act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton, and (2) extra-long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra-long staple cotton if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the cost of production of extra-long staple cotton in relation to the cost of production of American upland cotton in the areas where both of these types of cotton are produced. Disapproved by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to the extra-long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra-long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402.”

"2. Add a new section 420 to such act, reading as follows:

"“SEC. 420. Any price-support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall likewise be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.”

"SEC. —. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"“LONG STAPLE COTTON

"“SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbados species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"“(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 percent, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 percent of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

"(c) All provisions of this act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, that the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be 50 percent of the parity price for American-Egyptian cotton as of the date specified therein.

"(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is 1½ inches or more in length.

"(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse conditions."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand its purpose, the amendment submitted to my amendment is intended to give to long staple cotton producers price support similar to that given to upland cotton producers.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct, up to 30,000 bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would establish a minimum marketing quota equal to the larger of 30,000 bales or 30 percent of estimated domestic consumption and exports; is that right?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that the committee considered the amendment, but took no action on it because it was to be attached to a very controversial cotton bill, known as the Abernethy bill. Inasmuch as we took no action on the Abernethy bill, no action was taken on the amendment. In discussing the amendment, the committee agreed that its provisions should conform to the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. We understand that the pending amendment is practically in line with what the Department recommends and in those instances where the Department objects to the provisions of the amendment, I hope to adjust them in conference with the House.

I shall be glad to take this amendment to my amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

If there is no further amendment to be submitted, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. ELLENDER, explained the provisions of the bill very well. I should like, however, to make a few comments.

Commencing with the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1948, there was adopted a new parity formula known as the modernized parity formula. Until the Agricultural Act of 1948, the formula which was used to determine parity prices was the old 1909-14 base period formula.

The major basis of determining parity under the old parity formula was how many bushels of wheat would be required to buy a plow, how many pounds of cotton would be required to purchase a cotton picker, or how many bushels of corn would be required to purchase a corn planter, and so on.

The modernized parity formula used as a major basis of determining parity the average price received for farm commodities during the previous 10-year period. When first adopted the level of parity under the modernized parity formula was much lower for basics than under the old formula.

The contention of the supporters of the modernized parity formula was that as the years passed, the level of parity prices under the modernized formula would be about equal to those under the old formula for basic commodities.

There would have been considerable justification for that contention, had times been normal. However, because of the international situation and the resultant security program here in the United States, the Department of Agriculture is purposely carrying over large surpluses of the major agricultural commodities.

No three commodities are more important to the existence of man than are wheat, corn, and cotton. Because the United States Department of Agriculture is calling for increased production at a time when we are carrying over large surpluses, the surpluses we are creating by the increased production are a burden on the market, and hold down the prices to support levels or below.

Presently, the average cash price for wheat in the United States is only 84 percent of parity, while the support price is 90 percent of parity. By depressing prices in that manner, we can easily understand how the average price, as we move ahead under the modernized parity formula is lower than it would normally be.

For that reason, the spread has been widened between the old parity formula level and the level established under the modernized parity formula rather than narrowed.

Actually, we should not be carrying these wheat and other surpluses for war-emergency needs under the Commodity Credit Corporation at all. Under a different program we are stockpiling scarce war materials, such as tin, rubber, zinc, and perhaps 50 or 75 others; and they do not come into competition with prices of industrial products.

But in the case of agricultural commodities we are operating both a Com-

modity Credit Corporation program to support farm commodity prices and a separate program to produce increased surpluses and carry them purposely for war needs. As a result, prices have been depressed, and the modernized parity formula has not had a chance to operate as it might have otherwise.

It is for that reason that we are asking for an extension for 2 years of the use of the two parity formulas, whichever is the higher, for the basic commodities.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has agreed to study the whole parity formula system, in the hope of bringing out next year a parity formula which will be more equitable to all segments of agriculture.

Mr. President, during the period since World War II, we have appropriated approximately \$30,000,000,000 for foreign assistance. The countries that are receiving this money are buying our farm commodities, in most cases at far below the cost of production.

With respect to dairy products, we have been selling our surplus at 10, 15, or probably not higher than 50 percent of parity.

Under the International Wheat Agreement, we are providing these countries with wheat at \$1.80 a bushel, which probably would come within the range of 70 to 75 percent of parity.

As a result, the cost of the International Wheat Agreement has been approximately \$600,000,000, as estimated by Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As he has pointed out in his telegram to all Senators, Mr. Kline, rather than defend this worth-while program, tends to condemn it in his telegram to the Members of the Senate in his opposition to the House bill we are now considering. Actually, the International Wheat Agreement program ought to have been a part of the foreign-assistance program and its losses changed where it rightfully belongs—the foreign assistance program for which we are spending billions.

Mr. President, I may point out that in the foreign assistance appropriation bill which was passed just yesterday, providing economic assistance to foreign countries, there is an item of \$1,282,000,000 to give foreign countries money with which to purchase industrial equipment in the United States. Some of these items are very interesting.

For instance, in the bill there is an item of \$10,000,000 for the purchase of farm equipment. What price will those countries have to pay for that equipment? Not 80 percent or 90 percent of a fair price, but probably 100 percent or more.

The bill contains an item of \$11,000,000 for the purchase of fertilizer—again, not at 80 percent or 90 percent of a fair price, as in the case of agricultural commodities.

The bill contains an item of \$93,000,000 for the purchase of industrial machinery and equipment; \$100,000,000 for iron and steel; \$69,000,000 for aluminum; \$68,000,000 for copper; \$34,000,000 for zinc; \$66,000,000 for industrial chemicals; \$63,000,000 for solid fuels; \$8,000,000 for

lead; \$13,000,000 for lumber; \$14,000,000 for paper and pulp; and \$23,000,000 for nonferrous ores. Foreign countries will have United States appropriations to pay full price for these huge amounts of industrial goods at the full price.

Another item is for \$4,200,000,000 for military assistance. That money will be used to purchase military equipment, most of which will be purchased in the United States, not at 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent of a fair price, but probably at 100 percent or better. Why do we have to sell our agricultural commodities at reduced prices and charge the loss to the farm program?

I am attempting to point out the difference between the farmers' end of this entire assistance program and that with respect to industry.

Those who charge that the International Wheat Agreement or other agricultural programs have been a great loss to the Department of Agriculture, ought to consider the part the farmers are playing in this international plan of security.

Actually, Mr. President, during the 18 years of operation of the farm price-support program, so far as basic farm commodities are concerned—namely, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—until June 30, 1951, there was a net profit to the Government of the United States of \$40,000,000. The latest figure as of June 30, this year, is not available, and, I understand, will not be available for a few days.

There has been a net cost to the Government, so far as perishables and other than basic commodities, to Commodity Credit Corporation, of approximately \$1,000,000,000. That is understandable, because almost half of it was due to the potato support-price program.

Again, I may point out that we have been selling our surpluses, particularly surpluses of dairy products, eggs, and other farm commodities, to meet the needs of the people of Europe, if they were to survive, at 10, 15, and 20 cents on the dollar, while we are providing billions and billions of dollars worth of industrial equipment at the price demanded for it by industry in this country.

I may say to those who condemn the program of helping the people of Europe by giving them the most essential thing in their life—which is food—and who condemn the cost of that program, ought to consider what we are doing on the industrial side.

Mr. President, I should have preferred to support the House bill known as the Cooley bill, which embodies what is in the Young-Russell bill, namely, the continuing of the use of the dual parity program for an additional 2 years. That bill contains the provisions of a bill which I introduced almost a year ago, Senate bill 450, which would extend 90 percent supports for an additional period of years. I understand—and I think it is fair to say—that there are not sufficient votes in the Senate to secure what I believe to be these desirable provisions of the Cooley bill, so our only alternative is to support the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should first like to congratulate the Senator from North Dakota upon his excellent presentation. As a colleague of his on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I know how hard he works on farm problems, and how carefully he has studied this situation. While I associate myself completely with him in feeling that it would be much better to have the Cooley bill approved today, I, along with him, also realize that in the closing day, or next to the last day of this session, there is no possibility of overcoming the opposition which exists in this body to the Cooley bill. I simply want to emphasize the fact that while the Young-Russell bill will constitute a firm step forward, we have the further protection that in the Defense Production Act there is a guaranty of 90-percent parity for another year.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator from North Dakota feel that, during that year, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the able, distinguished, and completely nonpartisan leadership of our friend and chairman, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senate and the House can work out a support-price program to serve as a foundation and as a continuing aid to American prosperity?

Mr. YOUNG. That is my understanding of the agreement reached in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that he and I, as well as many other members of the committee, see eye to eye as to what we should do for agriculture. The question is, What can be enacted? I should like to say that the Cooley bill is, I think, an excellent bill. Though opposed by the Farm Bureau and the Grange, it was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture, and it received a vote of more than 2 to 1 by the Members of the House; which indicates that the Members of that body, representing the large consuming areas, and the farm areas, recognized the need of the bill, and what it could accomplish, both for the consumers and farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. So, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, were it not for the fact that we have in the Defense Production Act precisely the same protection for a year that the Cooley bill would give us for 3 years—

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. But for that, I would now join the Senator from North Dakota and many other friends of the farmer, I am sure, in remaining here, through July and August, and even September, if necessary, in order to give my support to a suitable price support program for the farmers. However, I am certain that the position of the two Committees on Agriculture is such that during the coming session of the Congress they will arrive at a formula for continuing the price-support program.

Mr. YOUNG. I desire to point out what the emergency war program is doing to the farmers. The Agriculture Department has been asking farmers to increase their wheat production at a time when we had a surplus of wheat; it was asking the cotton farmers to go all out in production of cotton, thereby creating a tremendous surplus. Is there anyone who doubts that the creation of a surplus has the effect of beating down prices, if the surplus is sufficiently large? Certainly the farmers who are doing their part in the emergency war program are entitled to protection. Now, certainly, with the surplus which is being created by compliance on the part of the farmers with the request of the Department of Agriculture to increase production, the increased production will cause prices to drop drastically.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The application of the 90 percent of parity support program is precisely the wartime philosophy which is being applied to other segments of the American economy. We meet the labor situation by giving labor a minimum wage law. We meet the manufacturers' and industrialists' position by giving them amortization contracts, for purposes of tax relief, and by giving them cost-plus-fee contracts. Were it not for the amendment incorporated in the Defense Production Act continuing the 90 percent of parity-support prices, it would mean that the farmer alone, in the whole economy, would be expected to produce for the war situation and the emergency and to take the entire risk upon his own shoulders with respect to the income he receives instead of simply applying to the farmer the same kind of formula which is being applied to other types of economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator is wrong in saying that the Defense Production Act guarantees net profits. I think that all it says is that the OPS Director shall not set a ceiling below 90 percent. I do not think there is any guaranty up to 90 percent, whatever. I have the bill before me now, for the first time, but if I remember correctly, it only says that the OPS Director shall not set a ceiling price below 90 percent, and has nothing to do with guaranteeing the profits.

Mr. YOUNG. My recollection is that it extends 90 percent support under the presnet Agricultural Act of 1949 for one additional year.

Mr. CAPEHART. I will check on that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 4 o'clock today, there be a call of the calendar of unobjected to bills placed on the calendar since the last call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator has a right to suggest the absence of a quorum in the time of another Senator, unless that Senator yields for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the absence of such yielding, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot do that at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand I do not have a right to withhold it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has a right to withdraw his objection. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the Senators from New Jersey and Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point letters from the Oregon Wheat Growers' League and the National Association of Wheat Growers, supporting Senate bill 2115, the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, and which is exactly the same as the provisions of the House bill that we are now considering.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., June 3, 1952.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: The Oregon Wheat Growers League has requested the support of the Oregon congressional delegation for the bill which you and Senator RUSSELL introduced to extend the present method of using both the old and new parity formulas for 2 years to figure the parity price for basic crops. The enclosed brief was also brought to their attention.

We appreciate your interest in the welfare of agriculture, and will do what we can to support this bill.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD ROOT, President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT
GROWERS,

Pendleton, Oreg., June 4, 1952.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: We wish to inform you that the National Association of Wheat Growers has gone on record supporting the bill which you and Senator RUSSELL recently introduced into Congress to extend the present method of figuring parity for basic crops for two more years.

The enclosed letter is a copy of letters we have written to the following Senators and Representatives requesting their support for your bill: WAYNE L. MORSE, GUY CORDON, TOM CONNALLY, HUGH BUTLER, EDWARD J. THYE, FRANK CARLSON, LOWELL STOCKMAN, WILLIAM R. POAGE, WALTER E. ROGERS, CLIFFORD HOPE, HAROLD COOLEY, WALTER HORAN.

We hope that our efforts will help secure enactment of this legislation necessary to the welfare of producers of basic agriculture products, especially wheat. If you have any

suggestions as to what further action we can take, please let us know.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

JENS TERJESON,
President, National Association of
Wheat Growers.

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a telegram received by me from Allan B. Kline, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., July 1, 1952.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price-support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops.

High, fixed price-support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers' ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international-wheat agreement, will cost over \$600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau
Federation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think it would come with better grace on the part of Mr. Kline, as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, had he given the true facts about the international-wheat agreement and the part it plays in the international program of security against communism, rather than to discredit the agreement by not stating all of the facts.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator consider that it is hopeless to get for the farmer 100-percent parity such as industry and labor are getting?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say to my distinguished colleague, that I think it is

hopeless at the present time. There are not sufficient votes to bring it about, although I agree with the Senator's program.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that when Congress convenes again, whenever that may be, a fight will be inaugurated on the part of certain Senators to get 100-percent parity?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; that is the plan.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the farmer is receiving the same miserable deal at the end of World War II that he received at the end of World War I? At the end of World War I the price of everything the farmer bought was kept up to 100 percent, while everything he sold went down almost to rock bottom.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. For example, in the case of farm machinery the index, as my distinguished colleague knows, was 101 when World War I ended, and it never receded, whereas the price of everything the farmer produced dropped steadily.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say that the price of everything the farmer has to buy has risen steadily in the period since the last war, and the price of products the farmers has to sell has declined steadily.

I may say to my distinguished colleague, who has just won a decisive victory, that received the biggest vote in areas supposed to be for sliding scale and lower supports. I think that is a tribute to him, and an expression on the part of these farmers in favor of high-level supports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] discussed the provisions of the Production Act, let me say that after the agricultural provision was adopted, I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and received this information with reference to section 106 (a):

Section 106 (a) of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 (S. 2594) would amend the fifth sentence of section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to read as follows (the new material in brackets):

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of either (1) the Agricultural Act of 1949 [except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402 of that act for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas], or (2) the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended."

That is an exact quotation from the provision of the act.

I read further:

The Department advises that this provision will require the 1953 crops of the basic commodities to be supported at 90 percent of

parity, assuming that title 4 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 remains in effect until April 30, 1953, as is now provided; since 1953 price support programs would normally be announced prior to April 30, 1953. Section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 requires the Secretary to announce the level of price support in advance of the planting season insofar as is practicable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was wrong in the statement I made, because the discussion we had with the conferees did not follow that line; but I am certain that all three of the able Senators are correct. It simply means that we do not really need to pass the bill, because we already have in the law the provision which is needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have it mandatory for 1953. If there is any necessity for having 90 percent of parity price supports mandatory in 1954 and 1955, we can attend to it next year.

Mr. CAPEHART. We do not need it until after the Defense Production Act expires.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, to pass this bill or to refuse to pass it means nothing.

Mr. YOUNG. But it does contain a provision which extends the use of the parity system for another 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in my opening remarks, there were two provisions in the pending bill, one of which dealt with the dual-parity program—

Mr. CAPEHART. Outside of that, the Defense Production Act does for 1953 exactly what section 2 does.

Mr. ELLENDER. For 1 year. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, there is nothing to be gained either by passing or turning down this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason why I asked that the Senate bill, which deals merely with the dual-parity program which was introduced by my distinguished friend from North Dakota, be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that it would be highly desirable to pass the House bill, which would give the farmers some assurance of what is going to happen to their prices in 1954 and 1955. The provision in the Defense Production Act takes care of them for only one more year, which is a very short period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I warmly compliment the junior Senator from North Dakota and his associate the junior Senator from Georgia. They have been the introducers and the very aggressive sponsors of this measure which is designed further to protect the farmers during this period of confusion.

In my opinion, there is real value in the immediate passage of the bill which we are now considering and of which the two Senators I mentioned are the sponsors, for the reason that in the Defense

Production Act there is machinery of two or three kinds which might result in the early termination of that act. The passage of the bill now under consideration would give complete assurance that throughout the next production year the dual system would prevail. But, further than that, it would give assurance looking to the future through 1955—and there is no farmer who is not looking a little further than the immediate crop year and hoping that he will have reasonable protection during the period which covers not only that 1 year but which will last beyond that time.

This is protection of the same kind that was given under the Steagall amendment during the troublous days of World War II, by which the farmers who produced the crops covered by that amendment were assured that not only through the duration of the war, but beyond that time, they might still depend on price support at a fixed figure, which gave them some protection as against the added cost of preparing new land for increased production, and in other ways gave them the assurance which they needed.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that the measure now under consideration is like the Steagall Act in that regard, for it gives protection over more than 1 year, indeed, for three additional years to those large groups of farmers which it covers, and it will be worth a great deal generally to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Florida for his comments. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and has always done an excellent job for the farmers of America.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to point out that while the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] originally raised a question of doubt as to whether the Defense Production Act actually provided 90-percent support prices, we have his subsequent statement that from reading the legislation he is convinced that it does. Someone reading the debate might be confused.

Paragraph (a) of section 106 was read to us by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is no doubt in the world about it, because it provides that while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent. We want to be sure that some subsequent reader of the RECORD or some interpreter downtown does not get an erroneous impression.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. After reading the act itself, there is no question in my mind that the act covers 90 percent of parity.

Mr. MUNDT. I merely want to have that made clear in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I should like to pay my tribute to the Senator from North Dakota for advancing the proposal and for his active support of higher parity and higher price supports. I believe there are two basic reasons why we need this extension for 1 year.

The Government is calling upon the farmer to increase production. That involves a risk, and a very heavy risk. That risk is involved with a type of commodity as to which the price structure might run up and down in the open market as compared with fixed prices for nonfarmers.

Second, there are large numbers of new farmers—the younger farmer, the veteran farmer, and the nonveteran farmer who have turned to the soil, and have been called upon to buy expensive machinery, rent equipment, or buy fertilizer. Those men simply cannot have a price-support program for only next year. It is not merely next year that they will have to pay on the equipment they purchase, if they are going to be sound producers. So the extension of several additional years, up to 1955, gives them something by which they can plan. It gives them an opportunity to operate on a systematic, planned basis for the utilization of their soil and production facilities.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has put it, this is a sort of Steagall amendment all over again. It worked well during the last period of emergency. I would remind the Senate that our defense program has been stretched out to 1955. That is the way we are thinking in terms of aircraft production and military preparedness. This measure would stretch out the program of 90 percent of parity supports to 1955. It fits right into the same kind of program which the mobilization officials of our country have asked us to adopt. We need agricultural mobilization as much as we need military mobilization.

I join with the Senator from North Dakota in support of this proposal and commend him for the work he has done in connection with the 90 percent of parity program, which, to my mind, is of basic importance. I do not see how farmers can get along on even 90 percent, in light of statistics which are revealing in terms of farm indebtedness and a reduction in real farm cash—not farm income, but real income.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed the references by the Senator from Florida and the junior Senator from Minnesota to the similarity of this bill with the Steagall bill. I cannot see to close a resemblance between the two, because this bill—if it is the version I have in mind—covers basic commodities, whereas in the Steagall bill the basic commodities were already covered. The Steagall bill covered 12 additional commodities.

I might point out to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that this bill with support at 90 percent of parity does not cover a great deal besides wheat, so far as his State is concerned. It leaves the poultry raisers, the dairymen, and

the hog raisers out of the program. The Steagall amendment was designed to cover, not the basic commodities, but the other commodities which were designated by Secretary Anderson, and there happened to be about 12 of them, including flax for oil, turkeys, of which the State of Minnesota produces a tremendous quantity—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it does.

Mr. AIKEN. Around Buckingham, and other parts of the State.

Mr. THYE. And around Worthington.

Mr. AIKEN. It includes hogs, poultry of certain kinds, and dairy products. None of them is covered by this bill, but they were all covered by the Steagall amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. The bill pending before the Senate, as I understand, covers only the provisions of the Young-Russell bill, which provides for a continuation of dual parity. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Do I understand that the bill has been amended to include a certain type of long-staple cotton? I made inquiry of the parliamentarian, and I understand that the bill has been amended to include a certain long-staple cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. What we struck out was section 2.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that stricken out on the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. What I did was simply to strike from the pending measure all after the enacting clause and to substitute the Senate bill. This is the Russell-Young bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. I prefer to make a statement of my own, first.

The implication was left that the only thing affecting Minnesota was with respect to wheat produced there. I should like to point out that this bill would prevent a drop in parity of more than 15 cents a bushel on corn. Minnesota also produces considerable corn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not think that so far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, he intended to involve Minnesota as being opposed to this bill in commenting on its probable effect. I do not wish the RECORD to show that Minnesota might be in any way involved in an argument which suggests that we are criticizing the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We are not.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota is not criticizing the bill. I am only attempting to clarify the question, because I was not here when this measure was taken up for discussion.

I asked the Parliamentarian, "What is the legislative question we are considering?" I was informed that for House bill 8122, Senate bill 2115 had been substituted, and that a certain amendment relating to long staple cotton had been

attached to the substitute and had become a part of it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not my fault.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that he left the inference for anyone who reads the RECORD that the Senators representing Minnesota were finding fault with a legislative measure that was before Congress. It was for that reason that I asked to be recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I wish to answer a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who did not know that the bill had been amended earlier.

Mr. THYE. May I first call one matter to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, because I wish the situation to be entirely clear. The Senator from North Dakota left the impression, in his statement referring to Minnesota, that the contention was being made here that the only thing from which we would benefit would be in wheat. That was the reason why I rose, because I know that the farmer will read this RECORD, and he rightfully should read it.

If the Senator from North Dakota will permit me to do so, I will first state that I join with him in support of this measure. If he will permit me further to state, I may say that at no time has the actual tiller of the soil, the producer, the man who operates the farm, been squeezed any more tightly economically than he is squeezed today. Taxes are up on personal property and real estate. The cost of repairs to machinery is up. The cost of new machines is double what it was 4 years ago. The price of pork has gone down steadily in the past 3 years. The price of dairy products is not commensurate with the cost that he must invest in his dairy unit and the cost of the hired help he is compelled to employ in order to take care of his dairy production.

There is today a greater distress in the diversified agricultural area of the United States than I have seen in the past 10 years. Economically, the farmer is squeezed today. He is squeezed more than he was at any time during World War II, both with respect to help on the farm, and with respect to other costs of operation.

Many persons believe that the farmer is exceedingly well off, because of the cost of food to the consumer. Let us examine the price of pork. Four years ago the producers received from 26 to 28 cents a pound for their pork. I will ask the consumers if they are paying more for pork at retail markets today than they did 4 years ago. They are. And yet the producer, as of today, is receiving from 18 to 19 cents a pound for his pork, whereas 4 or 5 years ago he received 28 cents. The difference between 28 cents a pound live weight for pork and a price of 18 or 19 cents is 9 or 10 cents a pound. The producer receives 9 or 10 cents a pound less today than he received for his pork 4 or 5 years ago.

That is what we are faced with. That is why I say, Mr. President, to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that I will join and support him in this

legislative measure, even though I know that some of the outstanding farm organizations in the United States do not approve of this type of legislative measure as of today.

Today the producer is economically depressed. In the event that the producer's purchasing power is diminished, destroyed, or dried up, it will not be long before the factories feel the effect of the lack of purchasing power on the part of the producer.

I believe that we who serve in Congress have just as much justification for taking a look at the problems of the farmer as we have for examining the businessman's problems, or the problems of citizens of foreign countries. We endeavor to assist the citizens of foreign countries in our European recovery program and in the mutual security expenditures which we are now making abroad to build up the defenses of those countries.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am sorry if I left the wrong impression concerning the good Senators from Minnesota. Certainly the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has made his position abundantly clear. I should like to add that no Member of the Senate has been a better friend of agriculture than has the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is only one statement that I wish to make in connection with this legislation. We do not sufficiently safeguard the interests of the man engaged in diversified farming, the man who produces poultry, eggs, pork, and dairy products. We are not today safeguarding that kind of producer, by the type of support program which would make certain that he is safeguarded against ruinously low prices, whether it be prices of eggs, pork, or other perishable products besides dairy products and eggs. I refer to such products as the citrus crop and other perishable crops.

Mr. YOUNG. I join the Senator from Minnesota in his comments. I shall be glad to join him at any time in working out a better program for other types of farming.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which has been prepared by Dr. Wilcox of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This statement relates to the pork price question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOG SUPPLIES AND PRICES, OCTOBER 1951—
SEPTEMBER 1952

An analysis of the application of alternative price support methods.

The hog-corn feeding ratio turned unfavorable for hog producers in November 1951 and remained unfavorable until May 1952. Hog prices declined almost steadily from a United

States average of \$20.50 per 100 pounds in July 1951 to \$16.40 in April 1952. The first part of the decline was a normal occurrence for the fall season, but prices continued to sag in mid-winter when they usually rise. The hog-corn ratio, which averaged 12.6 from 1931-50, fell from 12.6 in July to 9.8 in April.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture had discretionary legislative authority to support hog prices at any level up to 90 percent of parity, no price supports were announced. Some Members of Congress and leaders of farm groups urged the Secretary to support hog prices. Others urged the Secretary to take no action, fearing that heavy losses and serious product disposal problems would be encountered, similar to those resulting from the egg and potato price support programs. After considerable urging from the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the use of section 32 funds was authorized in April to purchase pork products for distribution through the school-lunch program and to public institutions.

A review of the supply and price behavior from October to date now makes possible estimates of the size of purchase or storage operations or the amount of direct payments which would have been required if price supports had been announced and either of these two methods used to carry them out.

The change in supplies, prices and other market data as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the first 7 months of the 1951-52 marketing year as compared with the first 7 months of 1950-51 are shown below:

Change from first 7 months, 1950-51, to first 7 months, 1951-52

Pork produced (pounds slaughtered commercially)	+ 8.1
Pork consumption per capita	+ 4.9
Increase in cold storage stocks	+20.3
Increase in marketing margin	+ 6.8
Decrease in retail price (pork products excluding lard)	- 3.7
Decrease in farm price of hogs	-10.8

The above data indicate there was nothing unusual about the price declines at the retail and farm levels in view of the 8 percent increase in pork slaughtered. The increase in storage stocks was to be expected and it is reported that available cold storage facilities were quite fully utilized.

Marketing margins usually widen under the impact of above-average supplies. When farmers offer more hogs for market without a compensating increase in consumer demand, processors offer lower prices at the farm which more than compensate for the mark-down in retail prices required to move the increased supplies into consumption or storage.

The United States average farm price of hogs during the period October 1951 to May 1952 compares with 90 percent of seasonally-adjusted October 1951 parity as follows:

Month	United States average farm price	90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity	Difference
1951—October	\$20.20	\$19.90	+\$0.30
November	18.10	18.24	-.14
December	17.60	17.22	+.38
1952—January	17.40	18.14	-.74
February	17.20	18.89	-1.69
March	16.70	19.63	-2.93
April	16.40	19.26	-2.86
May	20.00	18.93	+1.07

Hog prices are expected to average above 90 percent of parity for the remainder of the marketing year. On the basis of estimates made at this time, hog prices for May through September will average high enough

to pull the seasonal average up to 89 percent of parity.

In view of this it appears that, had price supports been announced at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity with direct payments used to make up the difference between the announced support price and the seasonal average market price, payments would have been extremely small. With approximately 18,000,000,000 pounds live weight of hogs marketed, direct payments would have been from zero to around \$50,000,000, depending on the level of prices the remainder of the marketing year.

If the Government had maintained hog prices at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity by purchase and storage operations the marketing mechanism would have been affected in a number of places. It is doubtful if the marketing margin would have widened as it did. This widening of marketing margins amounted to \$68,000,000 in the November-April period.

The volume of hog marketings also would have been smaller if prices had been supported at 90 percent of parity. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that breeding herds were reduced by 1,000,000 head of gilts sent to market because of the unfavorable hog-corn ratio. With prices supported, producers would have been more confident and less reduction would have occurred in spring farrowing, hence smaller marketings of gilts in the winter months.

Utilizing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, established relationships between supplies and prices, the removal of 278,000,000 pounds of pork, carcass weight, would have maintained hog prices at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity during the months from November 1951 through April 1952, assuming no change in other marketing activities.

This estimate is reduced sharply, however, by taking into account the effect of price support operations on the number of hogs marketed and on marketing margins. If half of the extra breeding gilts sent to market had been retained for spring farrowing and marketing margins had remained the same as a year earlier, hog prices might have been maintained at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity October 1951 to April 1952 by purchase and storage operations which removed 120,000,000 pounds from marketing channels in addition to the amount which did go into commercial storage.

Had the Government undertaken a price support operation, it probably would have been forced to make price supporting loans or purchase agreements covering almost all pork which went into commercial storage or a total in excess of 500,000,000 pounds. Cold storage facilities might have been taxed to capacity, and special programs might have been needed to free sufficient space to care for the additional pork placed in storage.

Prices in the May to September period would be somewhat lower than otherwise if the Government had acquired additional storage stocks. Total storage stocks would not have exceeded 15 percent of the current marketings May to September, however. Although a part of the price improvement November through April would be offset by the removal of storage stocks later in the year, farmers would gain by preventing the \$68,000,000 widening of the margin between farm and retail prices. Both farmers and consumers would benefit from the stabilizing effect on hog breeding plans of a price support program. At the present time it appears that spring farrowings in 1952 were reduced excessively as a result of the low hog prices in the winter months.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not rising to delay proceedings at all. I

simply wish to make some explanatory statements.

As I came into the Chamber the discussion seemed to be revolving around the proposal to make mandatory a minimum of 90 percent support of the six basic commodities, for 3 years more. The Senate bill which I have on my desk has been substituted for the so-called Cooley bill from the House which I found on my desk as I entered the Chamber.

The question of continuing a minimum of 90 percent support prices for the six basic commodities does not enter into this bill at all at this time. As a matter of fact, under existing legislation the Secretary of Agriculture has very broad authority in supporting the prices of farm commodities. I sometimes think he has almost too broad authority.

With relation to the amendment offered by the Senators from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. HAYDEN] relating to long staple cotton, I point out that I have had no opportunity to study this amendment. I did not know that it was coming up. I should like to point out that the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture is so broad that he has full authority to take care of the situation which is brought to our attention by the amendment of the two Senators from Arizona. At the present time the Secretary of Agriculture is actually supporting the price of long staple cotton at 153 percent of parity. He is authorized to do so by the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. I do not know that this amendment does any harm. It may do a great deal of good for the Senators from Arizona. However, I am not opposing it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is very necessary to maintain a program upon which the farmers can depend. The only program which the long staple cotton producers have is the program providing for the purchase of cotton by the Munitions Board. That is uncertain.

The amount of cotton involved is very small. Thirty thousand bales is a small amount of cotton. During World War II the Government called upon farmers to produce long-staple cotton. There was a time when we produced hardly enough from seed to keep the production of long-staple cotton going. If we are to maintain a minimum amount, we need this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not blame the Senators from Arizona and their cotton-growing constituents for wanting to know where they stand. As I say, the Secretary of Agriculture is now supporting the price of native long-staple cotton at \$1.07, or 153 percent of parity. Nevertheless, not long ago the Government was actually buying cotton of this grade from Egypt for more than \$1.40 a pound, or nearly 50 percent more than the price at which the price of our own native long-staple cotton was being supported. I do not blame the Senators from Arizona for wanting to have that situation definitely corrected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has just stated, it is true that the Secretary is supporting the price of long-staple cotton, but the fear is that with so much cotton being stored, the Secretary may not do so in the future. The amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona makes it mandatory that long-staple cotton shall be supported the same as upland cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible that the Commodity Credit Corporation has bought so much long-staple cotton from abroad for the Munitions Board that the very weight of the stock pile may seriously depress the price to our western long-staple cotton producers.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the growers of that product fear.

Mr. AIKEN. For that reason it may be just as well to have the program spelled out in the law.

As to the other part of the bill, or the main part of it that is now left, which permits the dual parity formula to continue for another 2 years. It is already authorized for at least one more year. It is true that the operations of the price controllers have upset the workings of the new parity formula. Under the old parity formula the base used was the years 1909 to 1914. Under the new parity formula the base consists of the immediately preceding 10 years, which would be much better in the long run.

Changing the parity formula would not give agriculture as a whole any more money. All agricultural commodities added together amount to 100 percent of parity. The formula is devised for the purpose of keeping each agricultural commodity in the proper price relationship with all the other commodities. However, if it is changed that does not give agriculture as a whole any more money or any less money, figuratively speaking, in comparison to the other factors of our economy.

It naturally follows that if one agricultural commodity gets more than it is entitled to it takes away from some other commodity.

However, I do not have any objection to continuing the parity formula for another 2 years beyond next year. I believe we must review the entire parity situation. Producers of certain commodities feel that it is not treating them fairly. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to correct such conditions when it is found, after an open hearing, that any particular commodity is discriminated against, or out of line with other commodities.

I know that if the new parity formula went into effect this year there would be a substantial drop in the price of wheat, and that situation probably would hold true for the next 3 or 4 years, or until the heavy surpluses which we have on hand at the present time were taken care of and the price went up in a free market, which we may not have for some time.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. It has been impossible for me to be on the floor during this debate because it was necessary for me to attend conferences on other bills.

Therefore, I may ask a question which has already been answered. I believe it is a fact that the leaders of some of the principal farm organizations have had rather strenuous objections to certain provisions of H. R. 8122. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if the objectionable provisions have been taken care of in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the objections which the Senator from Nebraska refers to were particularly directed at section 2 of the Cooley bill, which would guarantee a minimum of 90-percent support for basic farm commodities through 1955. I do not believe that the farm organizations would approve entirely of what we have before us, but I doubt that they are as strenuously opposed to it as they were to the Cooley provisions, which were stricken out.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. They have been stricken out?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, the right to choose the higher of two parity formulas will continue for another year in any event. During 1953 we must review carefully the whole agricultural situation. We may find that parity is not a fair method of arriving at what farm prices should be in relation to other commodities. It may be, if we are to have price controls pop up here and there, and have other factors come into the picture, that we will have to abandon the parity concept and find some other criterion of determining fair farm prices. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will continue dual parity for another 2 years beyond next year. In the meantime the next Congress will very likely consider the whole proposition. I do not see how any great harm can come from it at the present time. I would not agree to continue it indefinitely. But if it does not work, it will be changed anyway.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator from Vermont has been very fair. He recognizes the fact that when the Government is asking for increased production, the increased production depresses prices, as do ceiling prices, and a modernized parity formula does not have an opportunity to work, as it otherwise would.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Wheat is particularly affected by developments of the last 2 or 3 years. Normally our country uses a little more than 700,000,000 bushels of wheat. It is estimated that we will export approximately 375,000,000 bushels this year. I feel that the estimate by the Department of Agriculture may be a little high. I hope it is not. Under the law the legal carry-over is 163,000,000 bushels. The fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for such huge production of wheat, by next July we may have a carry-over of well

over 500,000,000 bushels, instead of 163,000,000 bushels which normally would be expected to be adequate. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture considers the program to be part of the preparedness program. He may be right in asking for the tremendous production of wheat. Under his emergency powers he has announced that there will be no quotas set on wheat next year. We may have another surplus of 100,000,000 bushels, and then we will have a real problem on our hands.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would not the Senator from Vermont agree that if we carried over 163,000,000 bushels, which is deemed to be the normal carry-over under the Agricultural Act of 1948, we could expect normal prices?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. With a carry-over of 500,000,000 bushels there is not any chance of wheat prices going above the support level.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from North Dakota is correct. If we carry over only 163,000,000 bushels the price of wheat would probably be 100 percent of parity. The fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for a huge production, and undoubtedly the price would collapse if it were not for price supports. The wheat grower is in a peculiar situation. For that reason I have sympathy with him. I would rather have the Secretary of Agriculture exercise the power which he possesses under the existing law to maintain the price of wheat at a reasonably good level, in view of the fact that he has himself asked for an over-production. But if he does not choose to do so under the law he can be required to do it. Apparently the growers feel they would rather have it required directly by law.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not also true that on account of the switch over to the modernized parity formula, as of now there will be a drop in parity of about 17 cents a bushel for corn and 1 cent or 1½ cents a pound for cotton?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that would be true, but the effect on the farmers in the case of corn would not be so great, because more corn would be used, and that would increase the value of practically all protein and animal products.

When the 1948 formula was developed, it was felt that it would be wise to encourage as much use of corn as possible, by having the farmers feed corn to livestock, thus putting the corn into meat and poultry products, because in that way from 4 to 6 bushels of grain will be disposed of, as compared to 1 bushel of grain disposed of when used for cereal diet. We deliberately set out to encourage an increased use of grain in the form of animal products.

So with that addition, I see no objection to enactment of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that each

4 years, on the eve of the presidential election, we get on the floor of the Senate an agricultural bill in connection with which the decisions are made from a political standpoint, rather than from a constructive standpoint for the American farmer. This bill proposes further extension of the artificial high supports on certain basic commodities.

I remember that in 1948 we passed an agricultural bill providing for a flexible support program. If that program had been allowed to go into effect as scheduled, I believe the American farmer would be much better off than he is today.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] pointed out how today the American farmers are in worse shape than they were during the depression years, on the basis of the prices they are receiving for the things they produce, as compared with the prices they are paying for the implements they have to buy. That just shows how a false sense of prosperity has been created by the program under the Democratic Party. I do not believe anyone will dispute that assertion.

Likewise, I have pointed out that the agricultural program, as it is being administered today, which takes care of just a few producers of a few basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, tobacco—at an artificially high level, is gradually bankrupting the poultry industry and the livestock industry in the United States as well as the consumers. There is very little that the present program can do to the poultry industry that it has not done in the last 2 years, because today that industry is practically on the rocks, from the standpoint of making a profit.

If this program is continued as proposed under this bill for another 6-year period, it will mean that in that 6-year period the parity program can be computed either under the old average or under the new average, and the result will be to continue an artificially supported high price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to make a correction: the bill extends it for 2 years, not 4 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator said it would apply for the next 6-year period, beginning January 1, 1950. That would take it to January 1, 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right; but we have already used up 3 years of that time, and it has one more year to go under present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps so, but by 1956 the 10-year cycle following the war will have been completed; and then, when we go back to computing prices on the last 10-year average, from 1956—computing them backward—the effect will be to compute them under the prices established under the 90-percent formula. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The dual-parity formula was begun in January 1950; and under the law as it now exists, it was to run for 4 years from January 1, 1950.

The amendment now proposed simply extends it 2 years more, or 6 years from 1950.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; but you go back to 4 years beyond 1950, and the 90-percent provision was in effect during those 4 years. When the 6 years are added to that 4-year period, you arrive at 10 years, when computed to January 1, 1956.

I thought we might as well recognize that if this bill is enacted, and if this contract with the farmers is lived up to, the high formula will be projected for the basic commodities until 1956, while the producers of other agricultural commodities remain unprotected.

If we do not change this agricultural program, whereby the Department of Agriculture will recognize that one farmer is one section of the country, even though he is a diversified farmer or a producer of livestock, is just as important to the economy of the Nation as is a farmer who is producing wheat and other grains the ultimate result will be to break down the entire agricultural program. The program today is splitting the farmers into two sections, one composed of the diversified farmers and livestock producers and one composed of those who favor this program because they reap substantial benefits from it.

The diversified farmers will not continue to take the blame of the high cost of living under an agricultural program which, in reality, not only gives them no benefit but actually penalizes them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In the case of cotton, if the price continues for another year at about the present price, by 1954 the parity price of cotton under the new formula will show an increase of $\frac{1}{2}$ cent or possibly 1 cent a pound above the price under the old formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least it will equalize it.

Mr. AIKEN. It will run about $\frac{1}{2}$ cent over, if it stays where it is.

However, in the case of wheat the Secretary has asked for such tremendous production that I think he is actually depressing the price, because with that production the wheat farmer can not hope to get more than the support price.

That happened in the case of potatoes. When the potato farmers had 60 percent support on potatoes, 60 percent of parity was all those farmers could get. Yet when the support price was removed, thus stopping a considerable amount of the growing of potatoes, those who did produce potatoes last year received from 90 percent to 100 percent.

So I think the new formula will raise the price of cotton in several years' time, and will increase by over 25 percent the parity value of cottonseed.

But in the case of wheat, I am inclined to think the tremendous production which the Secretary of Agriculture has requested will depress the price a little.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would assume that the Secretary would foresee the tremendous production and accumulation and would cut down on the requested production, because if that is not done, we do

not have in the Nation sufficient storage facilities to take care of all the wheat that will be produced with 2 or 3 bumper crops. The amount of storage cannot be cut down by increased purchases, because the farmers who are feeding the wheat to livestock cannot afford to buy it.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1948 Congress anticipated that the Secretary of Agriculture would comply with the act, as directed by Congress. However, he showed signs of not doing so; and in 1949 Congress took steps to require him to carry out the congressional intent, by putting in the bill certain definitions and other provisions.

However, the best bill in the world cannot do the job any better than the one who administers it will do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct; there is no question of that.

As the Senator from Vermont says the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, had failed to carry out the intent of Congress. I am reminded of a bulletin which the Secretary of Agriculture issued, and which I called attention to on this floor, several years ago, where he instructed his top, key officials, that in the course of their official duties, they should give more attention to getting his pet farm program enacted rather than to making the existing program work.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield, let me point out a case in which the law has not been used as quickly as was intended by Congress. The Senator from Delaware will recall that last winter and spring the price of hogs started going down, and dropped and dropped, until it fell below a fair price. When the price of pork started to go down, the Secretary of Agriculture did not move to support it, as he was authorized by the law to do. He could have supported it up to 90 percent of parity. However, the price went way below parity.

Before the announcement of any program to support the price of hogs, thousands and thousands of hog raisers had sold their brood sows because they felt they could not afford to keep them any longer.

Now we are faced with a probable shortage of pork, next fall as a result.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. And then the same man will then be pitying the consumers in the cities and will be advocating price controls.

Some day, Mr. President, the American people will wake up and will find that price controls or price tags emanating from a bureaucratic office in Washington do not taste very good when cooked in the pot. In order to have food, it is necessary to have something more than a bulletin from Washington. Washington does not produce food.

Mr. AIKEN. It is almost conclusive that after the price was forced so low, last spring, as to force the farmers to sell their brood sows, we can predict higher pork prices to the consumers this fall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and the same is true in the case of potatoes. When the price support was removed from

potatoes, the Department of Agriculture tried to scare the farmers to death by telling them how poorly they would fare in a free market, with the result that they cut back the acreage more than they would have done had the Government stayed out. At the same time, the threat was held over them of a price ceiling. Had the farmers been let alone, they would have gone on to produce the potatoes necessary to feed the people today. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has done more to confuse the farmers than any other organization, group, or individual in this country.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks because I recognize that today we are against a losing proposition. Nevertheless, I think it is important, if we want to get a good, sound agricultural program and keep it in effect, that we some day wake up to the fact and recognize that a farmer producing diversified crops in the East and the producer of livestock are entitled to some recognition. During the past few months we have been asked by many farmers in our area why it is that dairy feed and poultry feed are so much higher than they were even during the late war. The answer to that is that we are today supporting the prices of the basic commodities which go to make up the cost of feed to the dairyman and poultryman at levels which are about 40 percent higher than the ceiling prices on those same commodities during the war. At the same time, the producers of livestock are having to sell their products at prices which are lower than the prices were during the late war. As I have said, the poultry industry has already been seriously damaged, the pork industry is following closely behind, and before many months we are likely to see the beef industry in the same situation.

Mr. President, there is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to support all perishable commodities. I think the need in this country is for a sound agricultural program, one which will not be an incentive to production, because if we continue as we are doing today, under an artificially high support price, we are inevitably going to build up a huge surplus, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, and those surpluses are going to act as ceiling prices instead of support prices. The prices on wheat and corn will not rise above the support price when there are huge backlogs waiting to be dumped on the market. The same thing is true in the case of cotton. Whether the farmers want it or not under this administration, we are inevitably moving toward a controlled agricultural economy, with ceiling prices and support prices operating at the same time, under some governmental agency in Washington. If we are to have artificially high support prices, we must give to some governmental agency the control of acreage; and the farmers are going to be told how much they can plant, when they can plant, and what they can do with the crop. That is against everything we stand for in America. Furthermore, under this procedure, the small farmers will bear the heaviest burden on acreage cut-backs.

Mr. President, I do not think the American farmers want that. The two major farm organizations of this country have gone on record unanimously as being against the provisions of the pending bill and against artificially high support prices. They recognize the danger. I shall conclude my remarks by reading a telegram which I received yesterday from the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I think speaks louder as to what should be done in the matter of the agricultural program than anything else that could be said. The telegram, dated July 1, 1952, is from Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and reads as follows:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing rotation of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed price support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement, will cost over \$600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau
Federation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I have received from the Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc., signed by Ralph R. Peters, executive secretary, Dover, Del.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., July 2, 1952.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I know that you have been giving a lot of thought to agricultural programs and that when the time comes to vote you will support measures that you believe best for the Nation.

H. R. 8122, providing for extension of dual parity for 3 years and mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic crops, certainly is not in the best interests of farmers from this section of the country. I get

the National Farmers Union official publication and they are the chief supporters of high mandatory price supports.

High supports to farmers will certainly cause consumers to demand ceilings at support levels and soon farmers would have a completely controlled economy.

Price ceilings and high supports have been discussed at a great many meetings in Delaware and opposition was unanimous to both unless in an extreme emergency.

However, the majority are in favor of a flexible support program that will give farmers an opportunity to stay in business while they make the necessary adjustments.

I understand the high support legislation being pushed by Farmers Union will soon be before the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. PETERS,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I conclude in the hope that this Congress will reject the pending bill and will return next year, 1953, to work out an agricultural program which will recognize every farmer in America as being equally as important to our economy. Let us never forget the small farmer is the backbone of American agriculture just as small business is the backbone of our free enterprise system.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel it my responsibility as representing, in part, the State of New Jersey to insert in the RECORD in connection with the pending bill two messages which have come to me on the subject involved in the bill. The first one is from Mr. H. W. Vorhees, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

Farmers of our State are opposed to H. R. 8122, which will place rigid controls on agriculture until 1956. Your help in defeating this bill is requested. This is really important.

The other message which I received, and I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] read it into the RECORD, is from Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill. It is addressed to me, and I read the first paragraph:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122.

Then follows the telegram which the Senator from Delaware read in full.

SENATOR MOODY'S REPORT ON FARM POLICY

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, during this busy session of Congress I have spent considerable time and thought on agricultural problems. In order to get directly the views of farmers in my State, I have studied the positions of the farm organizations on various aspects of farm policy. And I have also mailed a large number of questionnaires to Michigan farmers to obtain their views first-hand on specific points relating to our efforts to promote a stable and prosperous farm economy. Our purpose, of course, is to prevent any recurrence of farm depression which would bring disaster to the entire country as well as to farmers.

I should like, therefore, to take a few moments of the Senate's time this after-

noon to report on some of the findings and thinking which I believe may be of interest to the Senate and also to my constituents.

A nation must eat. New cars, refrigerators, and television sets are mighty nice to have. But unless there is food in the pantry, nothing else matters.

This is the main reason why agriculture will always be our most important industry.

But agriculture's importance lies in more than this. If the farmer and his land prosper, the Nation is likely to prosper. When the farmer can buy, the manufacturer can sell; when the manufacturer can sell, there are jobs for city workers.

America has always known the value of the farmer's place in the scheme of things. But not everyone has recognized that the Nation's dependence on the farm is matched by the farmer's dependence on the rest of the Nation. What we do about inflation, military strength, unemployment, monopoly, taxation and foreign policy can make or break the farmer.

We know what can happen when these decisions are mishandled by men whose thinking has lagged behind reality.

Mr. President, I agree with some of the things which my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said a few moments ago. I differ, however, with his remarks regarding false prosperity. I wonder if he believes the farmers were prosperous before the Government put into effect its program.

Farmers will long remember the collapse of farm prices in 1921, and the lengthening shadows of the later twenties, warning of the gathering storm ahead. They will never forget the brief, tragic period when 233,000 farmers lost their homes and their land to the men holding the mortgages. They have vivid memories of milk holidays, bank failures, two-bit wheat, 15-cent corn, 2½-cent beef, and food rotting in the fields while city children lacked bread.

Farmers can recall when the parity ratio stood at 55 percent and the farmer cleared \$247 per year—\$247 per year on which to raise a family. That kind of poverty does not build character. It builds only despair and a burning sense of injustice.

In the last couple of decades, however, the American farmer has come up from the black pit of desperation, foreclosures, crashing farm prices, and staggering piles of unwanted crops. He has had behind him the assurance that the bottom would not be allowed to drop out of farm prices—as it does not drop out of the manufacturers' prices. He has had an opportunity to electrify his farm at a reasonable cost, bringing greater efficiency.

A realistic system of farm credit has helped him expand production and survive the lean years. An ever-normal granary has stabilized his supply of livestock feed, as well as safeguarded the Nation against food shortages. The Government has promoted the growth of farm cooperatives, brought about tremendous progress in soil conservation,

and stimulated modern farming practices.

Given a fair break, the farmer has forged ahead as never before.

It is important now, as we ponder what Government policies will be most helpful to farmers and the Nation, to compare agricultural conditions today with those of 20 years ago.

Seventy-five percent of our farmers own their own farms, compared to 58 percent in 1932.

Farm mortgage debt is down from more than \$9,000,000,000 to less than \$6,000,000,000.

Net farm income is up from \$1,900,000,000 to \$14,600,000,000 a year.

In 1929, only 8 percent of the Nation's farms had electricity; in 1932, it was only 9 percent. REA, plus enlightened policy of private utilities in some States, have raised this to 92 percent.

The State of Michigan leads the Nation in this field. Over 97 percent of Michigan farms are electrified today, compared with 14 percent in 1930.

Eighty percent of the Nation's farms are included in the 2,450 soil-conservation districts created since 1937.

But this is not all. Equally remarkable is the farmer's record of increasing man-hour output 70 percent in the last 20 years. Backed up by outstanding research in the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations, he has increased his efficiency in the past 10 years three times faster than the rate for industry. This is an astounding performance.

In Michigan, for example, the potato farmer is producing three times as many potatoes as in 1930, and on half the acreage. Bean growers harvest 50 percent more beans on only three-fifths the 1930 acreage. Total sugar beet production has doubled on only a third larger acreage.

The farmer has a right to be proud of this achievement. The Nation can also take pride and satisfaction in what has been done. Everyone in our country has profited, directly or indirectly, by the progress which the farmers have shown they can make if fair opportunities are given to them.

We have made a lot of progress—but we have not come to the end of the road. The world changes, and agriculture changes with it. Policies which are sound at one time are out of date at another. The farm program must be continually reexamined in the light of the changing picture of today and the prospects of tomorrow. If we are satisfied to pat ourselves on the back, if we forget to profit by the mistakes of the past, if we fail to look and plan ahead, we may lose what has been won.

What are the main questions farmers are asking themselves these days? It is important to face them squarely.

First, what Government policies will help the farmer meet the Nation's food requirements in the years ahead?

This is a crucial problem. We have already brought into production about all the farm land the Nation has. In some areas, in fact, we have plowed up land which better would have been left in sod. Yet, in 1975, it is estimated,

there will be five plates to fill, where now there are four. Every 24 hours 7,000 more persons look to the farmer for bread.

This presents a major challenge to the farmer, and a problem of utmost concern to the Nation. It is imperative that we follow the most modern practices, conserve our soil prudently, and insure that Government policy is geared to stimulate, rather than to stifle, production.

Of this we may be sure. The farmer likes to produce. Nothing suits him better than an opportunity to turn out bumper crops—at prices which net him a reasonable profit.

What governmental policies will help the farmer do the job?

Farmers do not ask for prices that make it tough on the low-income consumer. They do want and are entitled to a fair return on their labor and their investment. They do not want the taxpayer to carry them on his back. They do not want their freedom eroded. They are willing, however, to accept such intelligent rules as are necessary to their welfare and the welfare of the Nation.

To those sincerely seeking a farm program of maximum usefulness, a number of other questions press forward.

Is it fair to give price protection to some farmers and deny it to others? Since the question answers itself, how do we go about correcting the unequal situation that exists today?

What can and should be done to help the 1,200,000 farmers who produce less than \$2,000 worth of commodities every year? We have thousands of them in Michigan.

These farmers, many of whom got off to a bad start through no real fault of their own, are not enjoying the living standards America can offer. Whatever can be done to help them work out a satisfactory, self-sustaining income should be done.

These farmers do not want charity—and should not get it. But if we can help them get a new start, under conditions which bring out the best that is in them because they see the prospects of better things ahead, they can make important contributions to their communities which will be of advantage to all of us.

What amount and what kind of food reserves should the Nation have?

This is an exceptionally important question, because of the current threat to peace inherent in the ominous international conspiracy known as communism. Some hard thinking needs to be done in this area—now.

Finally, what should be our policy on the exporting and importing of farm products?

Farmers and farm organizations have already done a lot of spadework on most of these problems. So have Members of Congress. It is important that we get the right answers.

Here are a few suggestions. They are not put forward in any sense as final conclusions, or as the only answers. They are simply recommendations—recommendations which others will undoubtedly be able to improve upon.

But I hope they will provoke thought and discussion, and help contribute something toward the development of sound agricultural policies for our time.

Basic to the problem of protecting agriculture against depression and stimulating abundant and confident production, is the system of price supports. Price supports are essential to protect the Nation from a collapse of farm income which, in 1930 and at other times, has touched off major national depressions. Only war would be a greater disaster than another depression on the scale of the early thirties.

Our policy should be directed toward creating the economic climate in which farmers will produce to the maximum the foods we need, and receive for their products prices as close to parity as possible. This provides the best guaranty of adequate supply and therefore the best break for the consumer as well. After all, is not parity, by definition, the price at which the farmer can receive in the market place a return which will enable him to buy the things he needs on a fair basis? Farmers should not be forced to sell cheap and buy dear.

Of course, if price guaranties should bring about persistent surpluses of certain crops, or excessive costs to the taxpayer, or if to avoid these evils the Government should be tempted to impose too many controls, supports should be adjusted accordingly. The farmer must never be penalized for producing abundantly the things we need; on the contrary, he must be encouraged to do so. If production of a particular commodity goes beyond abundance and into waste, he would want sensible adjustments to protect both the farmer and the national economy. Some flexibility in the price-support system strengthens our capacity to deal with special situations.

A serious weakness in the present farm program is its failure to protect specialty crops adequately. Producers of fruits and vegetables have little price protection compared to other producers. Obviously, there can be no real justification for helping one group of farmers far more than others.

The regular price-support system does not seem to provide the answer for most perishable commodities. In order to maintain price-support guaranties in this area, the Government undoubtedly would have to resort to mass purchases from time to time. This frequently would be followed by the rotting or destruction of food, something none of us wants to see happen.

One alternative to price supports I have been studying, Mr. President, is a system of mutual price insurance. This idea should be thoroughly explored, for it may be the answer we are looking for.

In the field of fruits and vegetables, prices fluctuate sharply from year to year. Good prices 1 year may be followed by unprofitable prices the next. It may be possible to work out a voluntary, self-financing insurance plan to level out the losses suffered during bad years. If farmers were to contribute to the insurance fund during favorable years, and receive payments from the insurance pool during poor years—in pro-

portion to their marketings—we might go a long way toward solving the problem.

The Government's part should be limited if possible, to administering the plan, and paying the administrative costs. It would be hoped that no direct Government contribution would be necessary to persuade farmers to join the system in sufficient numbers to make it workable.

A plan of this nature would of course present difficulties. But if farmers put their best efforts into working out a sound insurance plan, these would not be insuperable.

Only in a major depression should it be necessary to supplement the insurance fund in order to give these producers the protection they unquestionably deserve.

The dilemma of low-income farmers, of course, presents a special problem requiring special treatment.

The Farmers' Home Administration, if its activities were expanded, could do a lot toward putting many low-income farmers on their feet. Wherever individual farmers want and need to enlarge their acreage, modernize their farms, or convert from a low-cost type of farming to a more costly type (such as livestock farming) the FHA should help them do the job if loans from private sources are not available. At the present time 96 percent of FHA loans are being paid on or before schedule. By carefully selecting enterprising farmers in unfortunate circumstances, thousands of farmers can be helped to get a new lease on life.

Another problem of national as well as individual importance is that of adequate food reserves.

Our present ever-normal granary program builds up reserves of a few storables to take care of normal ups and downs of national yields. But even this does not provide a reserve for great national emergencies. We know from our experiences in World War II and in the Korean conflict, how indispensable our food reserves can be.

When we are spending scores of billions on military defense and stockpiling critical metals for an hour of emergency, it is a tragic mistake not to stockpile food reserves for war. We need to store several hundred million bushels more of both corn and wheat, substantial amounts of fats and oils, dried beans and peas, canned milk, dried fruits, and such other items as are storable and necessary to a sound diet. In the event of an atomic world war, these reserves could mean the difference between our survival and the loss of all our liberties. Certainly we should not overlook the compelling need for a national food policy which recognizes the tremendous dangers involved in a world in which freedom and communism are locked in a gigantic struggle for the future of the human race.

In dealing with certain controversial aspects of agricultural policy, it is essential to be guided by the facts, and not be deceived by misconceptions of our national position, even if widely held.

There is a good deal of discussion about the advisability of allowing foreign farm produce to compete, to some extent, with our own. Many fail to real-

ize that, if we adopted a policy of isolation and exclusion, we would be damaging not only the Nation but also our farmers.

Our total farm exports in 1951 were valued at over \$4,000,000,000. This represented about one-ninth of the total value of farm produce sold during the year.

We imported only about \$2,300,000,000 of farm products which competed with our own. The balance of our imports consisted of noncompetitive items such as bananas, cocoa, coffee, and so forth.

During the first 4 months of 1952, to take a specific example, we exported far more dairy products than we imported.

After excluding the small amount of dairy exports which were subsidized by our Government, our dairy exports were almost three times as great as our imports.

Our overseas sales drain off surpluses which would otherwise depress the domestic price, or increase the cost of maintaining the support level. And here is the point to remember: Foreign nations have repeatedly threatened to raise barriers against American agricultural exports if we deny them the right to sell to us. We must make sure this does not happen. The loss of our foreign trade would be a major blow to the American farmer.

This, all too briefly, capsules part of the farm picture and points out some of the jobs that lie ahead. It is my earnest hope that the ideas touched on here will stimulate farmers to renewed efforts to strengthen the farm program to meet their needs and the needs of our people.

A prosperous agriculture goes far toward building the character of the Nation. It contributes stability. It nourishes the solid virtues of diligence, frugality, and self-reliance. It replenishes the Nation's human stock with those who have lived close to nature and to God.

The welfare of agriculture lies at the core of a sound economy. None of us can afford to permit the farmer once again to become America's forgotten man.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with reference to the farm bill.

I am also fully aware of the position taken by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as the position taken by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I realize, of course, that in the closing days of this session—and it may well be in the closing hours of the session—the Senate is unable to consider all angles of farm parity legislation. The Senator from Vermont has pointed out most vividly and clearly the position

in which we find ourselves and the protection which the farmers of the country should have.

I realize that there is some objection to the Cooley bill. Many persons in my State and some of the great farm organizations have emphasized to me the objections they have to that measure, but I sincerely feel that because of the shortness of time it would be wise for the Senate to take into consideration and pass the amended form of House bill 8122 which, of course, is incorporated in Senate bill 2115.

I fully agree with some of my colleagues who feel that during the next year we shall be in a position thoroughly to investigate and consider all avenues of legislative approach to this most important problem. Farmers are a vital segment of the economy of this Nation. I feel that the action the Senate is taking today with reference to the amended section of this measure is most important and is a practical way to handle the situation.

Mr. MARTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, relating to House bill 8122. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., July 1, 1952.
Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price-support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price-support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price-support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed price-support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement, will cost over \$600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price-support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwise stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau
Federation.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks, and then I shall request that a chart which I shall present be placed before the vote taken on the parity bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a chart showing the exact dollars spent for food in the United States from 1929 through 1951, and the exact amount of national income each year from 1929 through 1951, together with the percentage of the national income spent for food by all the people of the United States.

An interesting fact shown by the statistics in the chart is, for example, that in 1929 the percentage of the national income spent for food by all our people was 22½ percent and that the percentage of the national income spent for food by all our people in 1951 was about 21½ percent.

Another interesting fact shown by the chart is that the highest percentage of national income spent by our people for food was in 1932, when there was a depression. At that time our people spent 27½ percent of the national income for food. That was at a time when farm prices in the United States were very, very low. They were certainly terribly depressed. Yet the consumer in the United States spent for food in 1932, when the farmer was getting the lowest prices for his products, 27½ percent of the national income, whereas in 1951 the consumers of America spent for food only 21½ percent of the national income.

Those figures certainly prove that the consumer does not necessarily spend for food less percentagewise because farm products are low. If prosperity is maintained on the farms, there will be prosperity in the cities. There can be no question at all in my mind about that.

The chart is very enlightening, and it ought to put a stop to much of the uncalled for propaganda and unwarranted attacks which are made upon the American farmer to the effect that he is getting more than his share of income today because of high food prices. The American public are paying less today, based upon national income, than they paid in 1932, in the midst of the so-called depression.

Mr. President, I ask that the chart be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage of national income spent for food in the United States

Year	Food expenditures (millions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income for food
1929	\$19,674	\$87.4	22.5
1930	18,065	75.0	24.0
1931	14,779	58.9	25.0
1932	11,394	41.7	27.3
1933	10,876	39.6	27.4
1934	12,256	48.6	25.2
1935	13,690	56.8	24.1

Percentage of national income spent for food in the United States—Continued

Year	Food expenditures (millions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income for food
1936	\$15,295	\$64.7	23.6
1937	16,465	73.6	22.3
1938	15,669	67.4	23.2
1939	15,849	72.5	21.8
1940	17,085	81.3	20.9
1941	20,148	103.8	19.4
1942	25,254	137.1	18.4
1943	29,324	169.7	17.2
1944	31,879	183.8	17.4
1945	35,229	182.7	19.2
1946	41,615	180.3	23.1
1947	47,239	198.7	24.0
1948	51,587	223.5	23.0
1949	50,674	216.7	23.0
1950	52,838	239.0	22.1
1951	58,880	276.0	21.3

Note that the percentage of national income for food remains quite constant. This proves that the real cost of living cannot be reduced on a national basis through the medium of lower farm prices. The real cost of living can be reduced only through an increase in per man output. This is also true of the over-all standard of living.

1942-45, period of food subsidies under OPA.

PARITY FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that 90 percent of parity for agricultural products is included in the National Defense Act for the period for which the act was recently extended, most of the debate on the agricultural bill, H. R. 8122, appears to be more or less academic.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point telegrams received from the Nevada State Farm Bureau, the National Farm Bureau, and others, in the order of their date.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELLS, NEV., June 23, 1952.
Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I would urge your opposition to amendment to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid high-price supports. Ranchers believe all forms of support confusing and unnecessary at this time. Best regards.

RUSSEL WEEKS.

RENO, NEV., June 23, 1952.
Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

Resolutions of 1406 Farm Bureau families in Nevada oppose amendment to Agriculture Act 1949 calling for high-priced support. We are convinced this not in the long range interest of farmers. Looking to you to call a halt to these unsound proposals.

BILL HOWARN,
Nevada State Farm Bureau.

ELKO, NEV., June 24, 1952.
Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge you to oppose amendment to Agricultural Act 1949 for rigid high-price support. This looks like a trap for the ranchers and farmers.

NORMAN D. GLASER,
HALLECK, NEV.

RENO, NEV., June 24, 1952.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of the Washoe County Farm Bureau urge your effort to defeat proposal to amend Agricultural Act 1949 for high-price support. This is not the way to the hearts of Nevada farmers and ranchers.

ANGELO ROSSI,
President.

PIT MELINDY,
CAESAR GASPERI,
ANDY HANSON,
Board of Directors.

FALLON, NEV., June 25, 1952.

HON. GEO. W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.:

Nevada State Farm Bureau representing over 60 percent of Nevada farmers and ranchers is on record as opposed to urgent price support system. Price supports encourage over-production at the expense of overloaded taxpayers to the chagrin of participating taxpaying farmers. Production of agricultural commodities should be discouraged as production goes over 100 percent of normal. Flexible system needed. Have you forgotten Government meddling in the potato deal? We oppose amendments to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid price supports. Government manipulated guaranteed profits not analogous to free enterprise. We urge your support.

GEORGE FREY,
Legislative Director and Second Vice
President, Nevada State Farm Bureau.

MINDEN, NEV., June 25, 1952.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
We rigidly oppose the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 for high price supports. We feel that it has caused shortages and over-production.

Sincerely,
JOHN W. WHITE,
President, Douglas County Farm Bureau.

CHICAGO, ILL., July 1, 1952.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high level price support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed prices support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement, will cost over \$600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress

production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau
Federation.

RENO, NEV., July 2, 1952.

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

Again we urge your effort to vote down H. R. 8122 with which short-sighted Congressmen are mistakenly trying to buy votes. This bill is for the wartime support levels. This is not wartime. Such support levels will create surpluses for which Congress will take the blame. We observe this as another wedge for the Brannan plan. Will some of these Congressmen never see the light?

BILL HOWARD,
Nevada State Farm Bureau.

Mr. MALONE. Ninety percent of parity is included in the National Defense Act. Therefore, this bill, H. R. 8122, simply affirms something that has already become law.

The junior Senator from Nevada suggests that the entire system be reviewed by Congress in 1953, the Eighty-third Congress, and a feasible, workable method be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2115 is indefinitely postponed.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM IRRIGATION WORKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, yesterday during the call of the calendar the Senate passed Calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320. I wish my colleague would listen to what I am saying, because it involves a matter in which we are both interested.

This bill deals with the irrigation works in connection with the Chief Joseph Dam. Later in the proceedings the Chair noted that there was on the desk a measure passed by the House, House bill 6163, dealing with the same subject. From a casual reading of the two bills it appeared they were identical, hence the Chair, in an effort to expedite matters, obtained unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate bill was originally passed be reconsidered, and the House bill substituted for the Senate bill, and that Senate bill 2320 be indefinitely postponed.

Unfortunately, the two bills are not identical. Section 1 of the House bill contains ambiguities which were clarified by the Senate committee. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] suggested the changes. The text of the Senate bill therefore should be enacted.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which House bill 6163 was passed be reconsidered, and I further ask unanimous consent that the House bill be amended

by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of Senate bill 2320. That would mean that the Senate would send to the House the bill the Senate first passed yesterday, and I understand the House is in complete agreement with the changes. The Chair was endeavoring to be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 6163 was passed yesterday? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

The Senator from Washington now moves that all after the enacting clause of House bill 6163 be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2320. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provisions of this act to make a study and report to Congress on means of providing financial and other assistance in the reclamation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project. In making such study and report the Secretary shall be guided by the provisions of applicable laws.

Sec. 2. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shall state among other things, the construction cost of the proposed works, including said authorized project and proposed reclamation units; the portions of said cost allocable to various functions; the operation and maintenance costs of all functions (of the project); the amount of the construction cost allocable to irrigation which the irrigators may reasonably be expected to repay, together with the proposed charges for water service and proposed repayment period upon the irrigation allocation; the amount of the cost allocable to irrigation in excess of that which the irrigators can repay, which the Secretary proposes shall be recovered from power revenues; the proposed charges for power, and proposed repayment period on the amount allocable to power; the proposed interest rate on the power investment, and the disposition which the Secretary proposes to make of the interest component and other components of the power revenues; the unrecovered cost to the Federal Treasury of the works proposed, in connection with the means of financing recommended by the Secretary; the ratio of net costs to net benefits; the ratio of net benefits per acre to irrigators' repayment per acre; and a complete financial analysis of repayment program together with all other data reasonably required to enable the Congress to pass upon the economic feasibility of the proposed works.

Sec. 3. Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the study authorized by this act may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 2 of this act and section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

Sec. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant.

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

- S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;
 S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;
 S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;
 S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child;
 S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;
 S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Takteki Iriye;
 S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;
 S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;
 S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;
 S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madson, a minor;
 S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfried Bohm;
 S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;
 S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takanokano;
 S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;
 S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;
 S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegriani;
 S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);
 S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;
 S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;
 S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;
 S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;
 S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;
 S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;
 S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;
 S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;
 S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;
 S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;
 S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;
 S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;
 S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin; and
 S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amend-

ments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) to print proceedings at the presentation of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

- S. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to "Harry Strunk Lake";
 S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;
 S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;
 S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;
 S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board;
 S. 1310. An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines;
 S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member States on the Council of the Organization of American States;
 S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;
 S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;
 S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;
 S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;
 S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;
 S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;
 S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims;

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; and

S. 3337. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 457 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. FREAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. MARTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that my work with my good friend, the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has been very pleasant. He has been most cooperative. He has always informed me of any intention on the part of the minority, and I have tried to inform him of any inten-

tion on the part of the majority or the majority leader.

Perhaps once in a while we may slip; but we constantly do the best we can to protect individual Senators here on the floor of the Senate; and we expect to continue to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to give notice of the consideration of two more bills which the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would like to call up. They are H. R. 7126 and H. R. 5954, both dealing with the transfer of land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One of the bills, Mr. President, pertains to the Federal Government giving to the State of Colorado a quarter of an acre of land to be used for highways, and the other bill pertains to the vacation of some Federal ground, a small tract in Camden, N. J.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is another small bill which I may wish to move to have the Senate take up tomorrow. I wish to give notice of it at this time. I do not know whether I shall move to have the Senate take up the bill; but I wish to give notice now, so that if I shall decide to make that motion, the Senate will be on notice.

This measure is Senate bill 2137, Calendar 740. The bill is similar to another bill regarding public works and the leasing of property. As in the other situation, the bill involves a dispute between the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Public Works.

I do not know whether the differences will be settled. If they are not settled, I have no intention of moving to have the Senate take up the bill. However, I simply wish to call attention to this matter.

I hope I shall not have to move to have the Senate consider any measures about which I have not given notice; but if that necessity should arise, I shall certainly consult first with the minority leader and tell him why I shall have to depart from this rule.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because if there is one thing that I want when the Senate adjourns, it is to have Senators on both sides of the aisle feel that I have tried to be fair.

APPROPRIATION FOR POST OFFICE, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely want to give notice that, tomorrow, I shall ask to take up House bill 7778, which is a bill unanimously passed

by the House. It has come to the Senate. It is a most important bill in connection with a post office at Council Bluffs, Iowa, where unfortunately the public mails are being handled in a rat-infested ancient warren that should have been condemned and torn down years ago, and which was not even built for a public post office. It is very vital that the bill be passed. It has been delayed for a good many years, so I shall ask to have that bill taken up tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I hope the Senator will discuss the matter with the distinguished minority leader, and he and I will confer about it. Perhaps we will agree to take it up. Has the Senator spoken to me about it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is why I wanted to discuss it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has the Senator previously spoken to me about taking it up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not about taking it up. A day or two ago I spoke to the Senator about that and another bill. I did not emphasize the other one so much, because it was a bill of a different kind.

Mr. McFARLAND. Had the Senator come to me, we might have had his bill taken up today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator about it a day or two ago, but I did not emphasize it, because it was before the Public Works Committee and had not been reported. It has not yet been reported, as I think it should have been. But the other bill about which I spoke to the Senator yesterday and again today—and he was very kind about it—was one that had already been reported. It was passed this afternoon without objection. I appreciate the kindness of the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will confer with the distinguished minority leader about the bill in which the Senator from Iowa is interested, but I do not know what our attitude will be.

SOLDIER VOTING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that tomorrow, on behalf of myself and the distinguished majority leader and a large group of other Senators, every Senator here is invited to join in the submission of a resolution asking the Governors of the various States to cooperate in order to provide soldier voting. The House has failed to take action on the Senate bill to provide for soldier voting, and certainly at this time the men and women of the service, particularly the men who are fighting overseas, should have every right to vote, and an opportunity to vote. This resolution seems now to be the only thing that we can do. It would call upon the Governors of the various States to take such steps as they might find reasonable and proper to provide the right to vote to service men and women. I do not think there will be any objection, but I wanted to give notice that I intend to bring it up.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say there is a bill in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is very much interested. He is not presently on the floor, and I therefore do not ask for immediate consideration of the bill, but I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill S. 1084, which is Calendar No. 1387.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1084 to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL CONDUCTIVE TO IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES AND PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the conference report approving the Interior appropriation bill. I think the committees and the conferees have done a good job on this measure.

Particularly I consider this report and its approval by the Senate a long step forward in providing for a harmonious working relationship between the rural electric cooperatives and the public and private power interests. This bill, by establishing a continuing fund of \$1,000,000 for the Southwestern Power Administration insures the continuation of the contracts with both private power and public power sources for a cheap and dependable supply of wholesale power to serve the millions of farm customers in the southwestern area of the United States.

The passage of this measure will be a milestone in the progress of rural electrification throughout Oklahoma and the southwestern area.

Mr. President, for many years I have been an ardent and enthusiastic supporter of rural electrification. I have followed the progress of rural electrification from its inauspicious beginning 16 years ago when only 11 percent of the farms in this Nation were electrified, and I have never ceased to marvel at the astounding record of accomplishments and service of the REA to our farm families.

Sixteen years ago, 89 percent of America's farm homes were in darkness, without the advantages of labor-saving devices like washing machines, electric irons, and power tools and pumps, or the conveniences which add so greatly to the pleasures of daily living such as electric refrigerators, deep freezers, electric stoves, radios and television sets.

Sixteen years ago only 11 percent of our farms were receiving the electricity

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "first two sentences of the."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 28, 1944

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2657) to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill is and what contact, if any, he has made with the Members on the minority side.

Mr. STAGGERS. The bill is to strike language out of a bill that concerns the Department of Commerce. It was voted out of our committee unanimously by both sides.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think this had better be withdrawn until the gentleman has conferred with the other side.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request at this time.

UNVEILING OF BRONZE REPLICA OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 89.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings, held in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol at the presentation and unveiling of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence, be printed, with illustrations, in such form and style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, as a Senate document; and that 5,000 copies be printed, of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under authority heretofore granted, the Chair declares a recess until 4:15 p. m.

(Thereupon, at 3:28 p. m., the House stood in recess until 4:15 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I ask the gentleman what the other body did?

Mr. COOLEY. The other body substituted what is known as the Russell-Young bill for the House bill, with an amendment dealing with support prices for long staple cotton. It is hoped that the conferees will be able to reach an early agreement. You will recall that the first section of the House bill was identical with the Russell-Young bill, which dealt only with the old and modernized parity formula. The difference between the two bills being the 90 percent support price program on basic commodities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, GRANT, GATHINGS, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and HILL.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2483)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 20, 21, 22, 23, 23½, 24, 26, 34, 47, 48, 49, 61, and 62.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 30, 32, 33, 38, 39, 41, 51, 55, and 58, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$155,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,410,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of this or any other appropriation in this Act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 per centum of the amount expended for such purpose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,736,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$440,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,485,896,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$860,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$879,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Chiu But Yue, the minor child of a United States citizen father, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEVERLY JANE RUFFIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3284) for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Beverly Jane Ruffin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maj. and Mrs. James C. Ruffin, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANNAH CRUMET

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3343) for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Hannah Crumet, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Robert R. Crumet, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SADAKO ISHIGURO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2662) for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sadako Ishiguro, the Japanese fiancée of Quentin C. Auerswald, a citizen of the United States who has

been honorably discharged from the United States Navy, and that the said Sadako Ishiguro shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Sadako Ishiguro is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Quentin A. Auerswald, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sadako Ishiguro, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, sections 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sadako Ishiguro, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sadako Ishiguro as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB GITLIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 525) for the relief of Jacob Gitlin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Jacob Gitlin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D. BANNING

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3277) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,236.41, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of \$422.35 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of \$428.46 shall be credited in

the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of \$30.70 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; and not to exceed the sum of \$14.90 shall be credited in the accounts of Don Iler, regional disbursing officer, New York, N. Y., such credits being allowed to adjust certain overdrafts in such accounts; and (b) not to exceed the stated sums shall be paid to the following-named employees or former employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in reimbursement for amounts paid by them from their personal funds on account of counterfeit bills and notes accepted by them while in the discharge of their official duties: J. W. Bell, Ben Binkley, Ottmar W. Eppie, Adele Froussard, Caroline O. Gesner, Agatha M. Joy, Rosetta H. Little, James A. Metzger, Mary L. Milhollin, Edith G. Mohr, David R. Mooney, Jr., and Joseph C. Zoeliner, \$10 each; Bertha M. Barrett, F. H. Bowden, Jr., Joan Conrad, Mary Jane Davis, and Edward J. Jerge, \$20 each; and Ashton J. Daussat, A. L. Schwemm, Joe V. Vandiver, and Mildred F. Whartenby, \$30 each.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 8001, was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2584) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to establish, operate, and maintain on the property now in the possession of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Logan, Colo., a facility for the domiciliary care of veterans eligible for such care under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are authorized to be appropriated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING JOINT PATENTEE TO BRING SUIT ON PATENT IN COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3975) to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one of more of his copatentees is barred from doing so, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

bill (pp. 9545-6).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX - July 4

97. COOPERATIVES. Rep. McCarthy inserted Secretary Brannan's memorandum outlining USDA's policy regarding cooperatives (pp. A4476-7).
98. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Price commending the REA program and stating that "progress that has been made...is a monument to farm people themselves" (pp. A4479-80).
99. INFORMATION. Sen. Wiley discussed the "tremendous power wielded by the executive agencies by virtue of the legions of publicity experts" and inserted a Milwaukee Journal article claiming that the Forest Service sends out publicity materials that are not wanted (p. A4491).
100. COTTON. Rep. Cooley inserted a newspaper editorial commending the efforts of Rep. Abernethy in behalf of the cotton farmers (pp. A4463-4).
101. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. Bolling inserted a Washington Evening Star editorial criticizing the reduction in OPS appropriations (p. A4462).
102. HEALTH. Speech in the House by Rep. Fogarty favoring increased expenditures by the Federal Government for health research (pp. A4461-2).
103. RETIREMENT. Speech in the House by Rep. Springer favoring a cost-of-living increase in annuities of retired Federal employees (pp. A4478-9).
104. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Madden inserted his recent speech before the Indiana Democratic Convention discussing "today's farm prosperity through USDA programs" and commending REA (pp. A4498-500).
105. BUDGETING. Speech in the House by Rep. Colmer urging passage of the bill to create a joint budget committee and provide for additional investigations of the appropriation needs of Federal agencies (pp. A4495-6).

HOUSE - July 5

106. PRICE SUPPORTS. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 8122, to continue the dual parity formula through 1955 and to require 90%-of-parity price supports on basic commodities through 1954 (pp. 9761, 9640-3, 9723-4). This bill will now be sent to the President. The conferees agreed to reinstate the 90% provision with an amendment which makes it applicable only to the 1953 and 1954 crops instead of the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops as provided in the House version. They accepted the sections providing for price support for the 1953 crop of extra-long-staple cotton but with a modification of the basis for determining the level of support from a cost-of-production factor to the relationship between the farm price of long-staple cotton and the farm price of American upland cotton in the 7 years 1936-42 inclusive. (The committee stated that this will result in a support price for extra-long-staple cotton about 2.3 times the support price of short-staple cotton. The conferees changed the penalty rate for long-staple cotton from 50% of the parity price to a penalty of 50% of the parity price or 50% of the support price, whichever is higher. Rep. Hoeven had been appointed to replace Rep. Hill as a conferee on this bill (p. 9687).
107. SUBMARGINAL LANDS. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 7317, providing for

sale of a tract of SCS submarginal land to Hope, N. Mex. (p. 9687). This bill will now be sent to the President.

108. SOCIAL SECURITY. Both Houses adopted the conference report on H. R. 7800, to increase old-age and survivors benefits under the Social Security Act (pp. 9761, 9644-6, 9724-35). This bill will now be sent to the President. The conferees increased the income limitation to \$75 a month and deleted the Case amendment concerning agricultural workers.
109. CHEMICALS IN FOODS. Rep. Abernethy was authorized to file minority views on the investigation of the use of chemicals in foods and cosmetics (H. Rept. 2356, part 2), and the Select Committee on this matter submitted its report (pp. 9691, 9751).
110. ECONOMIC GROWTH. Rep. Burnside spoke on the economic growth of W. Va. in the last 20 years including the improved situation of the farmer (pp. 9708-12).
111. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 8370, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 9746-50). The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment (with a clarifying provision) to the House amendment (by Rep. Whitten) regarding sale of agricultural commodities, but stated that "The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language." The conferees also fixed the appropriations for Defense Production Administration at \$2,750,000, Economic Stabilization Agency at \$60,000,000, and Federal Civil Defense Administration at \$8,000,000; and fixed the price which may be paid for automobiles at \$1,400. The provision for a transmission line in Minn. was stricken "with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954." The House concurred in the Senate amendments to provide \$190,000 additional for SCS water conservation and utilization projects and \$125,000 for sea-water research through the Interior Department.
- Later the Senate rejected the conference report on this bill and asked for a further conference on the amendments in disagreement. The House subsequently adopted the second conference report. The "Daily Digest" states, "Action on this further conference was pending when this issue went to press," and it is our understanding that the Senate recessed until Mon., July 7, without completing action on this measure. (pp. 9746-50, 9774-83, D708, D710.)

SENATE - July 5

112. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7289 (pp. 9622-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.
113. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, returned the bill to conference for further consideration of amendments which had been reported in disagreement, and agreed to the second conference report (pp. 9634-40, 9751, 9784). This bill will now be sent to the President.
114. PERSONNEL RETIREMENT. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 2968, to provide for increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The conferees increased the limitation to \$2,160 yearly, made the increases effective through June 1954, and added the Secretary of Defense to the committee that will make a comprehensive survey of the retirement systems. (pp. 9622, 9675-6.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

FILE COPY

PARITY PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

JULY 5, 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 8122]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:*

“(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.”

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 101 (d) thereof:

“(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percentum of the parity price for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.”

SEC. 3. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such Act, as follows:

“(f) The provisions of this Act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton and (2) extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e)

of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra long staple cotton of the 1953 crop if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be at a level bearing the same relationship to the level of price support determined for American upland cotton as the average farm price for extra long staple cotton during the period 1936-42, inclusive, bore to such price for American upland cotton. Disapproval by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to the extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402."

2. Add a new section 420 to such Act, reading as follows:

"SEC. 420. Any price support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

SEC. 4. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"LONG STAPLE COTTON

"SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the *Barbadense* species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 per centum of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

"(c) All provisions of this Act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section:

Provided, That the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be the higher of 50 per centum of the parity price or 50 per centum of the support price for extra long staple cotton as of the date specified therein.

"(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is one and one-half inches or more in length.

"(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse conditions."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
C. B. HOEVEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

any people anywhere, any time. A greater variety of palatable and nutritious food is available to us than to others anywhere.

Food, clothing, and homes—more of and better than any other people ever possessed—we have.

A cow which produced 726 pounds of butterfat in 305 days, was bred by the American dairyman.

The American cattle raiser puts on four feet more and better meat than is produced in any other country.

The American poultryman has given us a hen which has produced more than 350 eggs a year—the top record.

And, so on, down the list, indefinitely, one might go.

And did all this come about through accident? Certainly not. We are in our enviable situation and condition because, and only because, under our system of Government, man's inventive power and desire for progress have been fostered and encouraged. And—do not forget this—our progress in industry and husbandry in merchandising, in every single activity which has contributed to our advancement and our progress, is based upon the practice of ever seeking the better tool and method, the discarding of the less efficient.

From the days of our forefathers, we have recognized that only through the process of selecting the better, discarding anything and everything when it failed to meet the test of the times, could continued progress be achieved, maintained.

But, today with our one indispensable resource upon which we must depend, not only for our prosperity and happiness, but for the security of our Nation, we are ignoring, we have discarded, the policy which has served us so well in every field of human endeavor.

The industrialist, the merchandiser, the businessman, each and all send their scrap, their culls, to the junk heap.

We, as a people and a Nation have been so frightened by fear created by false propaganda, we have been seduced into the belief that we may abandon the methods which have made us the happiest, the most prosperous, contented, and powerful people on God's green footstool. We have accepted the idea that we may send the best of our young manhood in ever increasing numbers, to fight and die on foreign soil in wars in which we have no real stake, without losing either our prosperity, liberty, or security.

The physically, mentally afflicted young men, the "culls" here used merely by way of emphasis and respectfully—we keep at home, send to college, hold in reserve for the husbands of our daughters, and upon them depend for the perpetuation of our race. And we bring from other lands hundreds of displaced persons.

Of the 2,654,125 men examined between September 1948 and May 1952, 1,063,450—about 40 percent—were rejected as either mentally, morally or physically, unfit to fight the battles on foreign soil.

I am not saying, nor am I intimating, that those who are rejected by our con-

scripting officials are in the slightest degree to be criticized because they do not meet the standards imposed by the Armed Services.

What I am saying and intend to say and insist is true is, that if any businessman, any industrialists, any tiller of the soil, any inventor, any professional man, anyone anywhere, followed the practice of destroying the best implements needed in connection with his activities, kept and used the less efficient, his failure would be as certain as day follows night.

What would happen to the cattleman who kept the long horned, long legged, bony steer for breeding and thus attempted to product beef?

What would happen to the poultryman, to the dairyman, the fruit grower, to the farmer, if each sought to further his activities by retaining for his own use—whether it was for production, breeding, planting or sowing—the less perfect materials at his command?

Oh, do I hear you say, "But only the best—those nearest perfection, mentally and physically—can render the utmost of service in wartime?" Quite true. But for how long and in how many wars may we, without disaster, continue to draw upon our store of young manhood?

The logical thing—and if we are to retain our security, make progress—is that we avoid entanglements in the affairs of others which inevitably lead us into wars in which the welfare of our people, the security of our Republic, are not directly involved.

It is axiomatic that we cannot support all those who, by our standards, are underprivileged; that we cannot fight in every war in which some other nation may become involved, without so weakening ourselves that our people will not only lose all those things which make life so enjoyable, lose our individual freedom and liberty, but we will destroy ourselves as a nation.

The time when we, as a people, should—as does every other nation—consider and act for our own security, is long past due.

The accomplishment of a good end is always to be hoped, striven, and prayed for, but foolish indeed is the individual and the nation which destroys itself in the attempt to bring about the impossible.

Charitable we should be—as always we have been—as the Good Book admonishes us to be charitable, but it also tells us that the Lord helps those who help themselves.

We also know that he who first destroys himself will never be able to help anyone.

The nation which, decade after decade, sends the flower of its youth to fight and die in war, is on the road to ruin.

RECESS VERSUS SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that this House should not adjourn sine die. In-

stead, there should be a recess with agreement to meet at a day certain—say in 30 or 60 days—or under agreement that we may be called into session upon call of the leadership of either the majority or minority of the House and Senate as a date upon which they may agree. I believe it to be for the best interest of the country that the House and Senate recess and not adjourn.

The situation existing in this country and conditions throughout the world are in such serious condition that the Congress should not, in my opinion, adjourn sine die at this time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at 12:38 a. m., subject to the call of the Chair.

(The proceedings of the House for this day subsequent to the recess will be printed in the next issue of the RECORD.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics. Report pursuant to House Resolution 74 and House Resolution 447, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolutions creating a select committee to investigate the use of chemicals in foods and cosmetics (Rept. No. 2356, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8120. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2488). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. Report on Investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Resolution 114, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and House Resolution 557, Eighty-second Congress, second session (Rept. No. 2489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 8122. A bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2490). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7800. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2491). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McGRATH: Committee of conference. H. R. 7313. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2492). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 8271. A bill to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rept. No. 2493). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2494). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7391. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2495). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. H. R. 2190. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way (Rept. No. 2496). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7268. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2497). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8539. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to people in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 8540. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8541. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the design, development, and service testing of jet transport aircraft in the manner recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8542. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study air safety conditions in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8543. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Policy to study various methods for limiting the taxing, appropriating, spending, and borrowing powers of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8544. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary center at Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 8545. A bill to provide flood relief for Lake Erie and the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 8546. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased benefits for certain medical correctional officers of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 8547. A bill to authorize the improvement of Mobile Harbor, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8548. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study ethical and moral

standards in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 8549. A bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 8550. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8551. A bill to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8552. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8553. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 8554. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 8555. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 8556. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8557. A bill to authorize the naturalization of parents of veterans without regard to certain requirements of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8558. A bill to enable States and their agencies and political subdivisions to plan for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8559. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8560. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 8561. A bill to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of certain capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8562. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of \$25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than \$50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8563. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (by request):

H. R. 8564. A bill for the relief of Arthur Kalisz (Arthur Kalisch); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 8565. A bill for the relief of Harry Clay Maull, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 8566. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

790. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 118 citizens of Greene County, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

791. Also, petition of 338 citizens of Sullivan County, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

792. Also, petition of 11 members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, First Christian Church, Sullivan, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

793. Also, petition of 16 members of the Alpha Bible Sunday School Class, Methodist Church, Linton, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

794. Also, petition of 48 citizens of Gosport, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

795. Also, petition of 24 citizens of Brazil, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

796. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Newberry, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

797. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Ownesville, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

798. Also, petition of 79 members of the Baptist Church, Sullivan, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

799. Also, petition of nine members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Jasonville, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

we have decided not to go ahead with the Aro contract.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not also true that if the Senate goes along with the constructive suggestion now being offered by the Senator from Missouri and recedes from its position, when we return in January, if by that time the Air Force puts before us new evidence and new data indicating that a new type of contract with the Aro Co. is desirable, it will still be possible at that time to enter into a contract even with that concern, provided the contract is properly arrived at.

Mr. KEM. Exactly, provided the proper steps are taken to protect the interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not also correct to say, with reference to the statement of the Senator from New Mexico about expediting the business of the Senate on the last day, that by receding from the Senate position at this time we eliminate all items in disagreement in the conference report? So that from the standpoint of expedition, it would help rather than delay?

Mr. KEM. If we recede from our position on the amendment, all differences between the House and Senate are immediately eliminated.

Mr. MUNDT. Whereas, if we were to insist on our amendment—and, as I understand the yea-and-nay vote in the House was 3 to 1 in support of its position—it is conceivable that we may involve ourselves in a legislative snarl which will take hours to unravel, and even then the Senate may have to recede from its position.

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to make one further point. With reference to what the Senator from New Mexico has stated, I agree completely about the hazards and the undesirability of having retired Army officers and Government procurement officers associate themselves with large corporations and then engage immediately in business with the Government. One of the nastiest and ugliest and most disgraceful scandals which our committee of investigation worked on involved Signal Corps procurement officers in Philadelphia who were doing business with a New York concern which was headed by retired officers of the Army. The amounts of money involved were small, but the activities were scandalous and disgraceful. They involved a great many small contracts on which competitive bids were unnecessary. Without any reason whatever, except because of connections established between men in the service and men recently retired from the service, business was allocated to the New York concern at tremendous cost to the taxpayers. I hope we can take some action in the Senate which will provide some regulatory solution to a situation which is increasing alarmingly.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from Missouri would inform me if I understand correctly the statement of Representative GORE on the floor of the House on April 9th, which is to be found at page 3937 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, namely, that General Carroll, who was originally in charge of the project thought that the maximum outlay which the Aro Co. should make was a million and a half dollars during the current year, and that at 3 percent the fee would have netted \$45,000. Representative GORE charged that General Carroll's superior, General Partridge, fixed the amount at \$3,000,000, which would give the Aro Co. a fee of \$90,000, and then removed General Carroll. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Missouri that the statement of Representative GORE is correct?

Mr. KEM. Yes; that is my understanding, with one exception. I understand that General Carroll's recommendation was a fee of \$25,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On an outlay of approximately \$840,000.

Mr. KEM. He considered that to be adequate. In that connection there is an interesting comment on the GAO report, which the Senator from South Dakota mentioned. It illustrates the pitfalls from the standpoint of the Government and taxpayers with respect to a contract of this kind. There was a very eminent engineer in the employ of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that General Farrell?

Mr. KEM. Yes. He was getting \$17,500 a year and the Aro Co. employed him at \$30,000. They took him away from the Atomic Energy Commission and raised his salary from \$17,500 to \$30,000. Of course, the taxpayers paid the difference. In the case of this type of contract we are in the position of bidding against ourselves for talent, which, of course, is a very ridiculous position from the standpoint of the taxpayers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question. The Senator from Missouri has mentioned Mr. Leo, who was hired by Aro to be its operating head at \$20,000 a year.

Does the Senator from Missouri understand that Mr. Leo had previous experience in the field of construction or of aerodynamics which would peculiarly qualify him for that position?

Mr. KEM. I am not acquainted with Mr. Leo, but my information is that his talents are along publicity lines, that he is one of the most skillful men in that field who ever operated on the Capital scene. David Lawrence has paid him the tribute of saying that he was the greatest ghost writer in Washington. With talents of that kind, and after taking the time required to attain that position in the field of ghost writing, it would be unusual if he also attained an outstanding position in the field of aerodynamics.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to engage in punning, but evidently if he was an expert in the field of wind, it was a different kind of wind. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 43, request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. KEM. When this motion is disposed of, will it be in order for me to move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not without having the Senate reconsider its vote on the preceding motion.

The motion referred to by the Senator from Missouri would be in order at this time.

Mr. KEM. Then, Mr. President, I now move—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the same issue will be decided in either case, regardless of the way the matter is presented? In other words, is it not correct that an affirmative vote on the motion I have made will be a vote to send the bill to a further conference, and a negative vote will be a vote to deny that, and to result in the defeat of the Senate amendment, in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at this time I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the motion of the Senator from Missouri is in the form of a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, and takes precedence over the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the new motion, that of the Senator from Missouri, which does have precedence over my motion, from a parliamentary point of view, presents the following situation: Senators who desire to stand by the Senate amendment should now vote "nay," against the motion of the Senator from Missouri, which is a motion to recede from the Senate amendment numbered 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll; and Mr. BENNETT voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has already begun, and one Senator has voted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask for a statement of the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

The roll call has already begun, and the clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WELKER. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Ne-

vada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bennett	Flanders	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Fulbright	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Morse
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Cordon	Jenner	Smathers
Douglas	Kem	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Williams

NAYS—34

Benton	Hunt	McKellar
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Robertson
Frear	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
George	Langer	Stennis
Gillette	Lehman	Underwood
Green	Long	Welker
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	McClellan	
Holland	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson	Hendrickson	O'Connor
Brewster	Ives	Russell
Bricker	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Bridges	Knowland	Seaton
Byrd	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Cain	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Malone	Sparkman
Dirksen	McCarran	Taft
Duff	McMahon	Thye
Eastland	Millikin	Tobey
Ecton	Neely	Wiley
Hayden	Nixon	

So Mr. KEM's motion was rejected.

Mr. WELKER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to change my vote from "nay" to "yea" on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 43 to House bill 7391. The change in vote would in no way affect the outcome of the final vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the Senate insist on its amendment numbered 43, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr.

SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to request again that persons, other than Senators, retire from the Senate Chamber, unless they have business requiring their attendance on the floor. It is difficult to transact business under the circumstances.

I have made a request of Senators that, when a conference report is pending, they refrain from making speeches on other matters until the conference report is disposed of. I hope that request will be observed. I know everyone is anxious to get away. Senators will have an opportunity to make their speeches, even if I have to sit here until 6 o'clock in the morning to listen to them.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say that in the conference on House bill 8122, the major point in disagreement was section 2 of the bill as passed by the House. That section would extend the level of price support at 90 percent for the basic commodities if marketing quotas had not been disapproved for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, or a period of 3 years. The conferees agreed to strike out "1955", so that the support will remain in effect at 90 percent for the years 1953 and 1954.

As to price support for long-staple cotton, it was agreed that the support price for 1 year, that is for the 1953 crop, would be based on the support price of American upland cotton. Thereafter it would be based upon its own parity price and supply level.

That is what the conferees agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I did not sign the conference report on this bill, of which the Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has just been speaking, and I think I should give my reason for not having done so. There are three provisions in the bill, none of which are necessary at this time, even though one

may believe in the wisdom of one or two of the provisions. The first would provide for the extension of the dual-parity formula for 2 years more. There is no need of acting on that at this time, because it continues through 1953, anyway. I have no serious objection to the extension of time provided in the bill, however.

Another provision deals with mandatory supports on long-staple cotton, at a rate somewhat in excess of parity for 1 year, and thereafter, as in relation to other types of cotton. It may be recalled that in 1948, when we enacted price-support legislation, we provided certain supports for cotton. At that time it did not occur to any of us that the Secretary of Agriculture would rule that long-staple cotton is not cotton. In my opinion that was a strange interpretation, but that was the interpretation, nevertheless, along with several others of similar character, which have since emanated from the Department of Agriculture. The amendment would not be needed in this bill, were the Secretary of Agriculture to do his duty as intended by the Congress. It is true that in preparing for war we must have substantial quantities of long-staple cotton. Last year, the growers in the Southwest produced cotton of this kind, for which they received something like 70 cents a pound, as I am informed. The Government then entered the Egyptian market and paid up to \$1.47 a pound for the same kind of cotton.

I do not blame the long-staple cotton growers of the Southwest for not wanting to trust their future to the Secretary of Agriculture or to the administration which is now handling matters. However, the Secretary of Agriculture is supporting the price of long-staple cotton this year at 153 percent of parity, using the emergency provisions of existing law with which to do it. However, it appears that the cotton growers of the Southwest do not trust him to continue to support their commodity at a high level in the event that the Egyptians want the market.

Mr. President, I do not object to this provision particularly, inasmuch as the high-level support is continued for only 1 year. What I do object to, primarily, is a provision which extends minimum 90-percent supports for the six basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, for 2 years following this year. I am not opposed in the least to 90-percent supports for those commodities this year. Under the law there is a guaranty of 90-percent support for those commodities for next year, but I do not believe we should fix the levels of support too far ahead if we are going to have the flexibility in our agricultural economy which is necessary in mapping our course for the future.

The conference report which we are asked to support guarantees 90 percent of support to six basic commodities for this year and the 2 years following. It does not take into consideration any of the other agricultural commodities. It does not consider turkeys or other poultry, or hogs, dairy products, beef, soy-

beans, dried beans and peas, or a host of other products.

When we guarantee a high level of support for the feed crops we are putting a squeeze on the users of those crops, particularly on the agricultural industry of this country. I believe it is unfair to guarantee years in advance a high level of support to the producers of those six commodities and not take into consideration the producers of dairy products, and meats, peas, beans, and other commodities.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of the fact that the National Defense Production Act provides 90 percent for next year, there is actually only 1 year in question, is there not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The House bill would have fixed the level of support of 90 percent for 3 years in advance. The conference report fixes it for 2 years in advance, bringing it up again for consideration in an election year. We should have an opportunity to consider it when there is not an election in the near future.

Mr. MUNDT. It is entirely possible that in the next 2-year interval we can reappraise the whole agricultural situation.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible. I do not think agreement to the conference report is going to be fatal by any stretch of the imagination. My position is well fixed against applying a level of support 3 years in advance—

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the purpose of the price support to protect the amount of production needed to meet the demand?

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of price supports is to assure adequate production and to maintain the national economy by not permitting prices for agricultural commodities to fall below a safe level. In the event that crops are needed, an additional production of certain crops in the interest of national defense, there is no limit to the support which the Secretary of Agriculture can place upon those crops, after a hearing. He has done that in the case of long-staple cotton, by fixing the support for this year at 153 percent.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not to insure the producers of crops and in order to encourage them to produce?

Mr. AIKEN. That is one of the major objectives.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator from Vermont think it might be wise, in fixing these guaranteed-price supports, to have them on a 1-year basis? I may remind the Senator from Vermont that we got into very serious difficulty with reference to potatoes a short time ago. Now we face a shortage of potatoes. Had we run from year to year we might have kept our crops in line from year to year.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from West Virginia is stating exactly the position of the Senator from Vermont, that the

levels of support should be fixed from year to year and not fixed for several years in advance.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I am very glad to be in agreement with such an able agriculturalist.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the Senator from Vermont mistaken when he says we should not plan ahead for 3 years? In the Middle West farmers must plan their crops as far as 4 years ahead. A farmer may want to plant clover and plow it under to get his land in better shape.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator is referring to the production of wheat, I think, if the law were handled better, the wheat growers of the Senator's State would be getting more for their wheat in the open market. I have pointed out that the bill applies a high level of support for this year and 2 years following to basic commodities only, and does not include other commodities which are of greater importance to the Nation and to our agriculture as well.

I should like to point out another reason why the high levels of support should not be fixed years in advance, which is brought to my attention by the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota.

What we should be concerned with primarily is farm income. Income is production multiplied by price. If there is a high guaranteed price for too many years, if it is guaranteed for too many years in advance, it is almost certain that the commodity affected will be thrown into quotas. If it were not for the proclaimed emergency, we would be facing quotas right now.

The Secretary of Agriculture asked for a high production of wheat, a production so high that next July 1 we will have not the normal carry-over of 163,000,000 bushels of wheat, but it appears now the carry-over of wheat will be around 500,000,000 bushels.

The Secretary has also announced that there will be no quotas on wheat next year, in accordance with his authority under the emergency provisions of existing law. Suppose, if there should be another surplus of 200,000,000, 300,000,000, or 400,000,000 bushels of wheat next year, we would be in such a situation that quotas would be almost necessary. When we apply quotas, the farm income is still production multiplied by price. But when we reduce production and hold the price up to where it was, farm income is reduced seriously.

Take the case of tobacco. Tobacco is working itself into trouble through the matter of quotas. We have just passed legislation which will permit the reduction of quotas of one type of tobacco down to seven-tenths of an acre. A man cannot live by producing seven-tenths of an acre of tobacco. He cannot possibly do so.

Peanuts are under permanent quotas now. In the event the emergency would terminate, as we hope it will, I can only see trouble ahead if we should have to apply quotas to wheat. If the emergency does not terminate, if we continue carrying substantial surpluses—and I think we have to in order to be safe—then we are faced with very substantial loss as to the Federal Treasury.

We have found in our investigations in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year that wheat and corn do not keep in good condition very long. Theoretically, wheat can be kept for 4 or 5 years. Actually, we are told, it starts to spoil within a year or two. It deteriorates in value. Corn becomes rancid after a year or a year and a half, and its value depreciates. The millers will not use old grain unless they are forced to do so. That means that it is necessary to dispose of the grain for whatever price can be obtained. That means a substantial loss.

We should not have a substantial loss, in the interest of the public welfare, of farm commodities in this country. I also wish to point out that today, because of high-support levels, 90 percent in the case of wheat, amounts to cost plus a considerable profit in eastern Colorado and western Kansas. It means cost plus a substantial profit in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and throughout the eastern States, including Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, and throughout those areas which would not normally be producing very large quantities of wheat.

Wheat should be produced in the areas best suited to this crop, including North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and other States in the West, but wheat will be produced throughout the eastern States in large quantities so long as there is a guaranty of cost plus a profit in the high-cost States.

Mr. YOUNG and Mr. WELKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, this year we will probably have a carry-over something like 500,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is because of the Department of Agriculture's program for a wheat surplus for security needs.

The fact that we will have this year a 500,000,000 bushel carry-over, or thereabouts, and the fact that, at the request of the United States Government, there will be wheat added to that quantity for the next year and the year following, indicate that farmers should have protection against price fluctuations, because they have purposely gone against their best judgment in building up surpluses. I think there should be an additional year for higher supports.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no quarrel with the statement of the Senator from North Dakota that when farmers are asked to produce crops large enough to break their own markets, they should have price protection. I would have no objec-

tion to fixing the support price at 100 percent or whatever level is necessary to get the required production, for 1 year at a time.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true, however, without entering into the over-all question of the validity of the position which the Senator from Vermont has taken, that his argument applies persuasively in normal conditions, but not in world conditions like those of the present, when we are engaged in a program of national defense, a program which we know is going to run well beyond a 2-year extension of the act? We are engaged in a program in which we have certain fixed responsibilities from the standpoint of supplying food abroad. There are arguments in favor of maintaining the 90-percent provision for another year which would not prevail in normal times.

Mr. AIKEN. They are certainly good arguments in connection with price supports for this year and next year. I would not go beyond a time 2 years in advance in encouraging a high level of supports.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator agree that there are good arguments for maintaining them this year and a year in advance, and fairly good arguments for one other year, which is in question in the proposed legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. That depends on whether we can determine that the threat of war is not going to be as acute 3 years from now as it was last year—I do not know how serious it is today. When the Senate voted down the St. Lawrence seaway proposal, I came to the conclusion that the threat of war was not so acute as some people said it was.

Mr. MUNDT. I can assure the Senator from Vermont that I agree with him in his statement about war and his desire for the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. That would help wheat.

Mr. MUNDT. I voted with the Senator from Vermont for the seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. And my reason for supporting him is due to the fact that the Senator from Vermont has stood steadfast in his position for many years. He is fair-minded enough to recognize that the world situation is such that at least there is more justification, in his mind, for extending the floor than would ordinarily be the case.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not assume that the threat of war might be as acute three years from now. There may be a change of administration which would result in a far better understanding among the nations of the world, and perhaps eliminate the threat of war.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has mentioned two eventualities devoutly to be desired. There is no question about it. If those eventualities develop, we will be very happy to have had an extension of 1 year more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am wondering what is before the Senate. I am a little confused about what is being discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the conference report on House bill 8122.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Vermont, who has had experience in agriculture, if it is not true that rigid price supports for potatoes wrecked the price-support program for that commodity, because that policy encouraged an expanded acreage and created such a surplus that a reaction took place, and in 1951 we entirely eliminated price supports on potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Idaho is correct. So long as we had a 60 percent support price for potatoes, 60 percent of parity was all the farmer could get for his potatoes. When the support price was eliminated the very next year the farmers, as a rule, received from 90 to 100 percent for their potatoes. I say that so long as we have 90 percent support on wheat—and I am for it this year and next year—the farmer cannot hope to get more than 90 percent for his wheat. He cannot hope to get 100 percent for his crop, unless we actually have war. I have already pointed out that too high a level of support, particularly if fixed too far in advance, continues production in uneconomic areas. It prevents conversion to crops which might be even better adapted and more profitable in that area.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont can explain why at the present moment wheat producers are receiving about 35 cents a bushel under the loan price.

Mr. AIKEN. They are receiving that price for several different reasons. First, the operation of the machinery for price support is not nearly perfect. Second, some will accept a lower price by selling their wheat immediately after the harvest, rather than to unwind the red tape involved—and it is not too serious—in obtaining a Government loan. Third, some are saving a little on their income taxes by disposing of it now, if I may throw in the last reason. Perhaps I should have not mentioned the third reason, but I think it is true.

Another reason why I object to fixing high support levels for farm commodities too far in advance is that when we do so we undertake not only to support the market of the American farmer at the high level, but we assume the support of the world market, or much of it.

In 1948, when the first permanent agricultural price support legislation was enacted, the administration asked us to strengthen section 22 so that the President might keep foreign imports from breaking down price support programs in this country. We strengthened that section, as requested by the administration, but the President has not used it to maintain prices. Instead, we have seen foreign commodities come into this country in such great quantities as to

break down our price support programs, and the President has not seen fit to use section 22 to do anything about it.

We recall that only 2 years ago huge imports of cheese and butter started to break down the support of the dairy price program. The result was that section 104 was put into the Defense Production Act last year. That was inserted for the simple reason that the President did not see fit to use the provisions of section 22 to take care of the situation. We have seen this year the effect of huge imports of grain from Canada. The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was telling me just the other day that because of huge Canadian imports oats in his area will bring only 55 cents a bushel to the farmer. That is a little less than the support price. So when we fix too high a level of support too far in advance, we must expect that other countries will seek to take advantage of it, and we must be prepared to support the world price as well as the price to our own farmers.

I may point out one other thing which happens if we seek to get the price too high; 90 percent parity is not too high for this year. I say it is not too high for next year, for the basic commodities, either. Beyond that I do not want to commit myself. But when the prices of particular commodities, particularly fibers, are too high, we are simply inviting substitutes any synthetics to come in and take that market away from us, or we are inviting a huge production of cotton or other commodities in the so-called underdeveloped countries, to be financed by our own investment bankers in the United States, who can get labor for as much per day as we pay per hour in this country, and then ask to have our trade barriers broken down. They get their 40 or 50 percent dividends on their investments, and call for the United States Armed Forces to protect them if necessary. What happens to the American producer in that case? He does not fare very well.

My principal objection to support levels that are too high is that it means dependency upon Government and political control of the farmers of this country.

Let me mention another factor, namely, the psychological effect upon the consumers. I can imagine what the consumers of the country and the press which claims to represent them are going to say when they read that we have guaranteed 90 percent support for some years in advance on the six basic commodities. They are not going to think in terms of the six basic commodities. They are going to think of the farmers as a whole, and every commodity they produce when they read that news. It is not going to do us any good. We must stop and reflect that only about 16 percent of the population of the country live on farms today. We must have the support of the people who live in the cities and in the suburbs—all the people of the country—in order to maintain agriculture in as strong a position as is necessary.

Suppose labor were guaranteed 90 percent of parity? We would howl if they got 90 percent for unemployment

compensation. Of course, that is not an exact parallel, but labor is getting its high price today in a free market. To be sure, it is guaranteed a minimum wage. However, that minimum wage does not compare with the wages labor is actually receiving. The minimum wage is to protect labor in the event of a depression.

Our aim should be not to put the farmers in the position where they are dependent on Government for their income, whether it be 90 percent parity or 100 percent—100 percent, of course, would be state socialism.

For any percentage of parity, our aim should be 100-percent income to the American farmer as compared to the income of other factors of our economy. This can be achieved through research, which our Department of Agriculture has not exploited to the degree authorized by the Congress some 6 years ago. It can be brought about through the judicious use of the provisions of section 22, which can regulate large imports from other countries when they start to break down our prices in this country. It can be brought about through better use of marketing agreements, and it can also be brought about through our own cooperatives. I think our cooperatives, if used to the best advantage, stand between the American farmer and Government controls, if he will only depend upon the cooperatives rather than look to the Government to support him and his family.

After we have used these things to the fullest degree, if the farmer is still deficient in income, we should talk about supporting the price so that he will be on a level with the other factors of our economy. I do not want to drive the farmer any further toward political and economic dependency upon the Government by fixing a high level of support too many years in advance. I do not want the farmers to get the idea that they can depend on a Government check for their income for that period of time. I believe 90-percent support for the basic commodities during this year is proper. Probably it will be all right for next year. I do think that we are heading for trouble if we fix it too far in advance. That is why I believe fixing it for 1 year after this year is sufficient. For that reason I did not sign the conference report which extends it for 2 years after this year.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Vermont in opposing the conference report. I believe we will make a serious mistake if we set up this program for an indefinite period. I believe Congress should give the American farmer a program on which he can rely, and not legislate constantly under the threat of war. If the threat of war is such that we must today, in the closing hours of the session, adopt a long-range farm program projecting higher levels of support—which is the only argument that has been used—we cannot very well talk about taking a 6-month vacation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO URGE PROPOSED LEGISLATION IN THE NEXT CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that when Congress reconvenes, if I have the honor of being a Member of the next Congress, I shall urge legislation which will be of aid to the civilian components of the Army in the construction of warehouses, and so forth.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this is probably the last day my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and I will serve together on this floor. When Senator O'CONOR announced that he would not seek reelection, I stated on the floor of the Senate at the time that in his going the Senate, the State of Maryland, and the Nation would lose a fine and able statesman. I now reiterate that statement. I shall miss him, as I know every other Senator will.

THE NATICK LABORATORY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I prepared relative to the laboratory at Natick, Mass., and also a copy of a letter which I wrote to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] under date of July 1, 1952. The letter is also signed by several other Senators.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The decision of the conferees to recede on the amendment I introduced to halt the expenditures of funds for the Natick laboratory is disappointing, particularly as the amendment was adopted unanimously by the Senate.

It is not my intention to object to the conference report, because of the failure to uphold this amendment and the other which I offered regarding the National Guard.

It is true the bill contained no funds for the Natick laboratory, but this amendment would have the effect of preventing any diverting of funds to expand the laboratory beyond the original appropriation, and it also would have had the effect of demonstrating strongly the sentiment of the Congress. The fact that the conference rejected the amendment must not be considered in any way an endorsement of this wasteful move.

The grave questions which were raised on the floor on Monday remain unanswered and the facts revealed in the course of our study of this problem must still be explained.

Our position and the outline of the disturbing evidence is contained in the letter which my colleagues and I submitted to the senior Senator from Wyoming on July 1. It is signed by Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, UNDERWOOD, SMITH of New Jersey, HENDRICKSON, CLEMENTS, CAPEHART, JENNER, HUMPHREY, THYE, LANGER, and myself. It contains the 10 major reasons—which have never been answered—for our objection to this consolidated laboratory.

I for one do not intend to rest until we get to the bottom of this campaign to create something obviously unnecessary and a duplication. I hope Senator MORSE presses an investigation by the Senate Preparedness Committee.

In closing I should like to mention our efforts to get together with the Secretary of Defense to reach some honest clarification of this matter. On March 17, 10 Senators and 69 Representatives wrote Secretary Lovett outlining our findings and requesting a meeting. We were not received by the Secretary.

Again our able colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], expressed our desire to confer. Again we were referred to subordinates who had no power to act.

Thursday the Secretary of Defense reached me and offered to meet with our group next Monday. The Secretary must know that Congress will have adjourned and that all of us have urgent obligations out of the Capital. We hope the Secretary will extend this offer so as to meet with him at the earliest practicable date.

The Secretary wrote me yesterday that "the question of delaying it for any extended period" presents a serious problem. I think we are correct in assuming that Secretary Lovett will at least hold up any contract letting and obligating of money for the Natick laboratory until such time as we have had an opportunity of meeting with him as a group—or until a few of us empowered to speak for the others have a chance to confer with him personally.

There is nothing so urgent about this so-called consolidation to compel Secretary Lovett to disregard this request to a group representing one-fourth of the population of the United States.

I never spoke more sincerely than when I state that it is the feeling of the group that this is a question which overrides any local or State interest. This is a matter of principle. We all support research, and we want development to benefit the fighting soldier. However, we resent and refuse support to needless construction done in the name of research.

JULY 1, 1952.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Knowing of your desire to obtain fuller information regarding the efforts of the Quartermaster Corps to establish at Natick, Mass., a consolidated research and development laboratory, in order that you and the other Senate conferees may effectively represent the Senate's stand on the amendment introduced by Senator MARTIN and adopted last evening, the undersigned respectfully present the following information and suggestions:

As was made clear during the debate on the Martin amendment, the 10 Senators from the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania sought unsuccessfully to see the Secretary of Defense and to present to him personally information which, they felt, would prompt him to abandon the Natick project as wasteful and unnecessary.

The Senate group recognized that Secretary Lovett has full authority to cease the expenditure of funds for the construction of the laboratory. It was felt that he would take such action after listening to the group. Unfortunately, a meeting could not be secured with Secretary Lovett. The group was referred to the Undersecretary of the Army, Mr. Karl Bendetsen. Only 2 of the 93 Representatives and 10 Senators opposed to the project chose to meet with the Undersecretary.

When a meeting with Secretary Lovett failed to materialize last week, the group decided to take the issue to the floor of the Senate.

The documents introduced in the RECORD last evening, and the charges made by individual Senators, speak for themselves. They outline facts sufficiently strong to warrant a full investigation by the Johnson subcommittee.

The unvarnished truth is that the project from the very beginning was so grossly mis-

represented as to deceive its proponents—who have acted in good faith—as well as those of us who had unsubstantiated misgivings over its validity. Since the enactment of the authorizing statute, we have found the following to be true:

1. Existing R. and D. facilities are excellent, with room for expansion.

2. Location of present R. and D. laboratories is based on their proximity to certain established industries, thus assuring constant and efficient contact.

3. Less than 10 percent of the employees to be moved are research scientists, the remaining 90 percent being engaged in applied development, specifications, and similar practical industrial occupations.

4. Consolidation of R. and D. activities at any vulnerable point violates the dispersal principle.

5. The Quartermaster has been unable to show any reduction of jobs through the consolidation. On the other hand, consolidation will require increased travel and long distance telephone.

6. The initiators of the project were aided in their efforts to secure the enactment of Public Law 424 by testifying time and time again that there was no intention to include in the consolidation the Chicago Food and Container Section. Yet—as was brought out in the debate last evening by Senator DOUGLAS—after the money was authorized an immediate effort was started to include the Chicago laboratory.

Except for the watchfulness of the congressional group, this expensive addition to the project would have been achieved. Moreover, the argument now made by the Quartermaster General that the movement of the Chicago Food and Container Section is not necessary for effective consolidation destroys his whole case. In any investigation held, it will be possible to show through expert testimony that if consolidation is valid at all, the Chicago Food and Container Section should be the first to move.

We feel that this is a perfect example of duplicity, a demonstration of the old Army tactic of getting the camel's head under the tent.

7. Special equipment required by the Quartermaster Corps is now available in other installations throughout the defense establishment. Failure to utilize such equipment, when surplus to the needs of another branch, violates the unification principle.

8. The transfer of present personnel and their families from Chicago, Philadelphia, Jeffersonville, and Washington to Natick would require vast new housing. We believe an investigation will reveal that speculators have been busy from the beginning seeking to exploit this situation. A \$25,000,000 real estate promotion is involved in the consolidation.

9. The Department has disregarded the explicit instructions of Public Law 424 in selecting the site. The excuse given for changing the site recommended by the impartial ad hoc committee is that a million dollars was saved thereby. Planning was so poor that the Army was attempting to orient the land to a building which had already been designed. Had the original site been Boston Common, the Army could have claimed a saving of \$200,000,000 by shifting to Natick.

10. The most ominous factor involved in the whole project has been the suppression of honest opinion given by qualified QM personnel whenever that opinion ran contrary to the ambitions of the Quartermaster Corps. The record reveals a disinclination to admit errors and the pursuit of a program designed to justify the project at all costs. Information has been withheld, suppressed and distorted. The scope, cost, and purpose of the consolidation has been changed frequently—whenever our group has called at-

tention to inconsistencies. Military considerations, as well as principles of sound management, have been cast aside.

As the Senator from Wyoming realizes, it is always difficult to pinpoint waste in a budget as large as that advanced by the Defense Establishment. By careful study and investigation, the undersigned have found this clear example of waste in the Defense budget. The eventual cost of the Natick laboratory may well exceed \$50,000,000. We are convinced the whole sum will be wasted unless action is now taken to halt the project. Public funds will be spent to achieve results far inferior to the highly successful work now being performed without the expenditure.

Recognizing that the Congress will adjourn shortly, it is urged that you express to the Secretary of Defense the desire of the Senate that all further expenditures for the Natick project will be halted until the Congress again meets and after a full opportunity has been afforded to investigate the charges that the consolidated laboratory is wasteful and unnecessary; that it can only hope, at best, to duplicate functions already being performed most adequately at the existing R. and D. laboratories in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Jeffersonville, Ind.

It should be stressed that not one of the \$11,000,000 appropriated will be used for research. The entire sum will be used for consolidation.

Any delay in the expenditure of these funds would not in any way interfere with or retard the valuable research now in progress at the three laboratories named. Even Senator SALTONSTALL admitted during the last evening's debate that great contributions have been made in the R. and D. field during the past several years at existing laboratories.

The revocation of Public Law 424, Eighty-first Congress, could undoubtedly be achieved if time permitted. Since it does not, we are hopeful you can convince the Secretary of Defense of the wisdom of halting the expenditure of funds already appropriated. Under the Martin amendment none of the funds contained in the pending appropriation bill for the defense establishment could be used for the consolidated laboratory.

It is regretted that the unwillingness of the Secretary of Defense to meet with the Senators from the five States concerned compelled a somewhat unorthodox parliamentary procedure. Nevertheless, the uniqueness of our effort should not be used as an argument against making a possible saving of \$50,000,000.

It should be noted that the first major bids on this project are to be opened tomorrow.

With assurances of our high regards,

Very sincerely,

MARTIN,
DOUGLAS,
UNDERWOOD,
CLEMENTS,
CAPEHART,
JENNER,
HENDRICKSON,
LANGER,
MORSE,
HUMPHREY,
SMITH (New Jersey),
THYE.

Senators.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of

MORTON, of Kentucky, has decided to retire. He has been an excellent Congressman, a loyal friend, and a charming host. May he enjoy a well-earned rest at his home in the blue grass.

I sincerely hope he will choose to again represent his district in the United States House of Representatives. Good luck MORT, to you and Clay Belle.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], is a gentleman in every sense of the word. Even though he has served in the Congress but a relatively short time he leaves an enviable record of service to his district and his country.

It has been a privilege to serve with him. It is most regrettable that he has elected to retire. He will be greatly missed.

I would like to wish him and his charming wife every good fortune and happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been not only a high privilege but a great personal pleasure to have had the opportunity to serve with that fine gentleman from Kentucky, THRUSTON MORTON. I regret exceedingly that he has decided not to run again. He brought to his congressional service a deep and clear perception of issues involved in legislation and their ultimate effect on our national life and welfare. He brought also a firm sincerity and high courage in maintaining his convictions. I, along with his host of friends, shall miss him greatly, not only because of the friendship of which he gave so graciously and unstintingly, but also out of profound respect for the incalculable worth to his State and Nation that his service here has and would have continued to contribute.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, has decided to retire from the House of Representatives. He is a Member of whom I have become very fond. He is a good-natured friend. He is always well-informed and interprets his information shrewdly. He has served his district well. He has a lovely wife and family. Like many of his other friends, I am sorry that our paths seem to be drawing apart.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today marks the final day of congressional service for a real friend and a fine Representative in Congress. On and off the floor of the House, THRUSTON MORTON, more familiarly known as Governor, was a congenial and effective worker for the legislation in which he believed.

THRUSTON MORTON never lacked political courage. On many roll-call votes, the name of THRUSTON MORTON would be found on the currently unpopular side, but the side which represented sound judgment and the protection of America's heritage.

Mrs. Davis and I numbered Governor and Mrs. Morton among our finest Washington friends. We shall miss them, but shall indeed wish them well, and shall look forward to seeing them here or elsewhere in the future.

Surely his voluntary retirement from Congress does not mean that his public

service has ended. I cannot help but feel that the people of Kentucky will call on THRUSTON MORTON for public service in the future.

And so farewell, Governor, may our paths cross again soon.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleague in tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. Soon after we came as freshmen to the Eightieth Congress he made his mark as one of the truly able Members of this House.

Keen and incisive in thought, direct and forthright in speech, stanch and fearless in character, he leaves the imprint of his personality not only on the records of the Congress but on the minds and hearts of all of us who have served with him.

We shall miss him from these halls but we shall hear more of him anon.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the voluntary retirement from Congress of the Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky. THRUSTON was one of the first fellows I met in Congress when I came in 1949. Since then it has been my good fortune to learn to know him personally and to observe his work on the floor of the House. The State of Kentucky is losing an outstanding Representative, the Congress a faithful worker, and I a real friend in THRUSTON's retirement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that our good friend THRUSTON MORTON is leaving the House of Representatives. All of us will miss him as a good friend and able colleague but the real tragedy is that the Nation will lose one of its best Members. THRUSTON MORTON has been one of the most constructive members of the House Committee on Education and Labor and he served on that committee when the pressure was greatest and the controversies most violent. He never faltered under pressure. I have always been guided by his advice and counsel on all matters under the jurisdiction of that great committee. It is regrettable that he is leaving this body. I hope he will return often and stay long even though such visits may not be on official business. It goes without saying that we will welcome him back as a Member, either in this body or the other.

CONTINUING EXISTING METHOD OF COMPUTING PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2490)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference,

have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

"SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 101 (d) thereof:

"(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas."

"SEC. 3. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such Act, as follows:

"(f) The provisions of this Act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton and (2) extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra long staple cotton of the 1953 crop if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be at a level bearing the same relationship to the level of price support determined for American upland cotton as the average farm price for extra long staple cotton during the period 1936-42, inclusive, bore to such price for American upland cotton. Disapproval by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to the extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402."

"2. Add a new section 420 to such Act, reading as follows:

"SEC. 420. Any price support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

"SEC. 4. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"LONG STAPLE COTTON

"SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbados species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the market-

ing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 per centum of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

"(c) All provisions of this Act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, That the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be the higher of 50 per centum of the parity price or 50 per centum of the support price for extra long staple cotton as of the date specified therein.

"(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is one and one-half inches or more in length.

"(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse condition."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing methods of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted new language which was in part the same as that in the House bill. The result of the Senate action was to leave section 1 of the House bill unchanged, to strike out all of section 2, and to add two new sections to the bill providing price support for extra-long-staple cotton.

The effect of the action taken by the committee of conference is to leave section 1 of the House bill unchanged, to reinstate section 2 with modifications, and to accept the new sections adopted by the Senate, dealing with long-staple cotton, with some modifications. Details of the changes are set out below.

Section 1: This section, which extends the dual parity provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, is the same as section 1 of the House bill.

Section 2: This section, which was eliminated from the bill by the Senate, has been reinstated with an amendment which makes the provisions of the section applicable only to crops of 1953 and 1954, instead of the three years 1953-55 provided in the House bill.

Sections 3 and 4: The purpose of these sections, as agreed to by the committee of conference, is to provide price support for the 1953 crop of extra-long-staple cotton based on the historical ratio of the price of such cotton to the price of upland cotton. As adopted by the Senate, these sections would have based the level of support upon a cost of production factor.

As agreed to by the committee of conference, the level of support for extra-long-staple cotton will be determined by the relationship between the farm price of long-staple cotton and the farm price of American upland cotton in the 7 years 1936-42 inclusive. The committee is informed that this will result in a support price for extra-long-staple cotton about 2.3 times the support price of short-staple cotton.

At present price levels this would provide a support price in the neighborhood of 75 cents per pound for long-staple cotton. Under the incentive production program announced by the Department of Agriculture to produce long-staple cotton for strategic purposes, the support price of the 1952 crop is about \$1.05 per pound. The support level for 1953 provided in this bill, therefore, is approximately 30 cents per pound below the present level of price support.

As adopted by the Senate, these sections would have been permanent legislation. As agreed by the committee of conference, the provisions relating to the level of support for long-staple cotton will apply only to the 1953 crop.

These sections also require that price-support programs for cottonseed or cottonseed products be extended to cover the seeds or products of long-staple cotton.

The committee of conference also made a minor change in the provision of section 4 relating to the penalty rate for long-staple cotton. As adopted by the Senate, the bill provided that the penalty should be 50 per centum of the parity price. The committee of conference amended this provision to make the penalty 50 per centum of the parity price or 50 per centum of the support price, whichever is higher.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report shows again what I have contended right along that this whole question of agricultural price supports by the Federal Government and its treatment in the Congress not being an adversary proceeding is not going to hold the proper balance between the

interests of farmers and the interests of consumers. Here we have the whole fixed 90 percent support continued on the six basic commodities, the modern parity formula we adopted in a considered way shunted aside again and a new price support plan added for long staple cotton all in this conference report.

I made my fight on the bill when it was before us in the House but lost on a record vote. However, that vote showed that a very substantial minority questioned the validity of the inflexibility of this price support bill. I feel sincerely that this policy will prove to be unwise for farmers in that its very inflexibility has the difficulty of bringing on an unfavorable reaction from the 80 percent of the population who are now farm consumers and whose support for any kind of Government price supports is essential.

I hope that in the next Congress the whole program of Government farm price supports may be reviewed and a policy holding an even balance between farmers and consumers may result. Some support is needed to avoid a 1932-type economic break for the farmer but I feel the whole program has gone far beyond that into close to price guaranties. In addition this has had a tendency to cause the whole chain of middlemen and what they charge to be overlooked and this is of great importance to both farmers and consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[Mr. CROSSER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMENDING TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increased old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2491)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 13, 20, 21, and 23, and from its amendment to the title.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 16, and agree to the same.

AN ACT

To continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

“(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.”

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 101 (d) thereof:

“(6) The level of support of cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.”

SEC. 3. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such Act, as follows:

“(f) The provisions of this Act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton and (2) extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra long staple cotton of the 1953 crop if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be at a level bearing the same relationship to the level of price support determined for American upland cotton as the average farm price for extra long staple cotton during the period 1936-1942, inclusive, bore to such price for American upland cotton. Disapproval by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this Act with respect to the extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402.”

2. Add a new section 420 to such Act, reading as follows:

“SEC. 420. Any price support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.”

SEC. 4. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

“LONG STAPLE COTTON

“SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbados species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated

Agricultural
commodities.
Parity prices.
63 Stat. 1056.
7 U.S.C. § 1301.
66 Stat. 758.
66 Stat. 759.

7 U.S.C. § 1441.
Cooperators.

Cotton.

Infra.

7 U.S.C. § 1422.

Long staple
cotton.

63 Stat. 675.
7 U.S.C. § 1347.

Exemptions.

by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

National mar-
keting quotas.

66 Stat. 759.
66 Stat. 760.

“(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of thirty thousand bales or a number of bales equal to 30 per centum of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

63 Stat. 670.
7 U.S.C.
§§ 1342, 1344.

“(c) All provisions of this Act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, That the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be the higher of 50 per centum of the parity price or 50 per centum of the support price for extra long staple cotton as of the date specified therein.

7 U.S.C.
§ 1346.

“(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is one and one-half inches or more in length.

“(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse condition.”

Approved July 17, 1952.

3540E